Duke University Libraries
D02294782Y

DUKE
UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY

Duke University Library

The use of this thesis is subject to the usual restrictions that govern the use of manuscript material. Reproduction or quotation of the text is permitted only upon written authorization from the author of the thesis and from the academic department by which it was accepted. Proper acknowledgment must be given in all printed references or quotations.

THE JOINT COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC EDUCATION: A PROGRAM FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

by

Richard Nelson Hill

Department of Education
Duke University

Date: August 27, 1980

Approved:

William H. Cartwright, Supervisor

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Education in the Graduate School of Duke University

1980

ABSTRACT

THE JOINT COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC EDUCATION: A PROGRAM FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

by

Richard Nelson Hill

Department of Education
Duke University

Date: August 27, 1980

Approved:

William H. Cartwright, Supervisor

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Education in the Graduate School of Duke University

1980

THE JOINT COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC EDUCATION: A PROGRAM FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

The Joint Council on Economic Education celebrated its thirtieth anniversary in 1979. It was organized for the purpose of helping to improve the economic literacy of the American public through more effective instruction of economics in the nation's schools. It comprised an affiliated council in almost every state and over two hundred centers of economic education, located on college and university campuses. The affiliated councils were able to work effectively with local school systems. They organized workshops for teachers and administrators, conducted in-service projects or helped local school systems become part of the DEEP Cooperating Schools network. The centers tapped the skills of economics and education faculty members for use in the economic education movement.

The Joint Council earned the support of leaders in all areas of economic activity: this support was shown in participation on boards of trustees and in financial grants to the Joint Council or to the network of affiliated councils and centers. Academic economists participated in projects directed by the Joint Council. The interaction of community, school, and academic support of the Joint Council program resulted in a process for achieving curriculum change. The development of this process of organizing support was the greatest success of the Joint Council.

The Joint Council helped develop programs for improving the preparation of teacher candidates, and for improving the quality of economics instruction in the colleges and universities. It worked closely with the American Economic Association to achieve a coordination of interest, and supported projects of that organization.

The Joint Council and its network produced materials for classroom use. It also supported evaluation projects of other economic education materials and offered advice to textbook publishers to improve the quality of their materials. It published the biannual Journal of Economic Education, the only journal devoted entirely to that subject.

The records and publications of the Joint Council were used for this paper, as well as materials published by organizations linked to the program of the Joint Council: these include the American Economic Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the National Association of Secondary-School Principals. Secondary sources included articles about the program or organization of the Joint Council, or about economic education. A search of the literature located the secondary sources, and the Joint Council allowed the author full use of its current and historical files and of its library.

The existence of the network of councils and centers, and the success it achieved in generating financial support for its program, offered a pattern for groups interested in bringing about curriculum change. Specific elements of the program also offered examples of how to improve instruction in

the secondary schools, possibly in areas other than economic education. Finally, the ability of the Joint Council to produce high-quality written and audio-visual materials resulted in tools for improving instruction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

1. BACKGROUND AND FORMATION OF THE JOINT COUNCIL 4

2. THE NETWORK OF AFFILIATED COUNCILS AND CENTERS OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION 22

3. THE PROGRAM OF THE JOINT COUNCIL: IN-SERVICE EDUCATION 60

4. THE PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM 100

5. MATERIALS PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION 138

6. THE JOINT COUNCIL AFTER THIRTY YEARS 168

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 173

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Analysis of Boards of Trustee Membership; 30 Affiliated State Councils; By Sector Represented 29

Figure 2. The Typical Affiliated State Council Board of Trustees Membership 29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper began in a seminar in the spring of 1974 while I was completing the course work required for the Ed. D. degree. Research was done at Duke University, and for short periods in the summers of 1976, 1977, and 1978 in the New York offices of the Joint Council on Economic Education. The difficulty of separating the program of the Joint Council from the larger category of economic education, and of considering a program that was nationwide in scope, caused the writing time for this paper to be longer than was desired by anyone concerned. That it was completed at all was due to the help and encouragement of several people who deserve more than these few words of thanks.

The most important figure behind this paper is my advisor, Dr. William H. Cartwright. From the first contacts in 1969, when I was first considering becoming a teacher, through the long period of classwork, research and writing, Dr. Cartwright has been a source of inspiration, wisdom and encouragement. He brought wit and a discerning eye to a task that attempted to couple "deathless prose" with a more lively style. He was always ready to help, and the help never failed to be generous and vital.

I have also benefited from the help and concern of Dr. Peter Carbone, Dr. Charles Johnson, Dr. Warren Lerner, and Dr. David Martin. Material I learned in their classes has proved valuable in my professional life, but of more importance has been their friendly support and advice. Equally

concerned and supportive have been my principal, James E. G. Sills, and my supervisor, Richard Haynes.

John Redmond, the Director of the North Carolina Council on Economic Education, made available his files and publications, while giving me an insight to the Joint Council from the viewpoint of the local council. The staff of the Joint Council in New York have been supportive in my research, and always took time to answer any questions or offer suggestions. I especially want to thank June Gilliard, my fellow North Carolinian, who took time from her work (and her own dissertation) to help me. And while mentioning New York I want to thank my aunt, Edith Cassera, who loaned me a bed and more meals than I can recall, when I stayed with her for three consecutive summers.

Most importantly, I owe this paper to my wife, Scott. She has put up with the pressure and the expense, and the separation, without questioning or complaining, and has tendered assistance in countless ways. To her, and Kathy and Chris, I dedicate this paper.

INTRODUCTION

On any given day a secondary school student in the United States is brought into contact with issues that, if not entirely economic in nature, at least have significant economic overtones; increases or decreases in inflation and unemployment, increases or decreases in the value of the dollar on the international exchange, federal projects proposed or enacted, school funds threatened because of voter unhappiness with property tax, are but a few examples of the kinds of economic developments taking place every day in the world around today's high school student. Some of these problems may seem distant and far removed to the average student, who does not see his needs or goals affected by or involved with the problem. On the other hand some economic events may seem frighteningly imminent and may call forth intensely personal reaction. Between these two extremes lies a broad range of reactions, from ignorance or indifference to understanding and informed action.

Though ignorance is never to be prized, and indifference is often a mask that attempts to conceal ignorance, economics as a social science discipline is sufficiently complicated to escape the unaided comprehension of the average student. And until the middle of the 20th Century there was no concerted national effort to do more than offer such aid as would help the student lead a more productive life as a consumer of the nation's goods and services. The 1940 Yearbook of the National

Council for the Social Studies, for instance, was more broadly devoted to "consumer economics" and its role in the public schools than it was to the comprehensive and analytic examination of economics as a social science discipline. This examination would have included economic theory, economic analysis of government policies, comparative economic systems, or "macro" or "micro" economics in general. Commissions and reports before that time, especially during the "economics conscious" thirties, had recommended that the schools should either expand their curriculum to include economics as a separate course or expand their treatment of economics wherever it was included in the curriculum. But the vast majority of this nation's secondary school students managed to graduate without being challenged by anything remotely similar to the study of the field of economics.

By the 1940s, it seemed evident to many Americans that this condition was no longer adequate for either the individual student or the nation which the school system served. As the decade of the 1940s brought revolutionary changes in the world at large, it also became a symbolic turning point for "economic education." For reasons that will be examined in this paper, too much had been changed, or could no longer be accepted, and some new paths for economics in the public schools needed to be sought out, examined, and followed. The recognition of the changed situation in economic education was felt by educators, economists, businessmen, and concerned laymen in general, and played a significant role in the creation of the Joint Council on Economic Education in 1949. Since its establishment,

the Joint Council has come increasingly to the fore as the national leader for improved economic literacy in the general population, and improved economics instruction in the public schools. This paper will examine and describe the philosophy, the organization, and the program of the Joint Council as it has developed these to serve the secondary school student.

In order to carry out its function as a service agency to improve economic education, the Joint Council has made contacts with school systems, academic and professional economists, and curriculum specialists to help determine that curriculum which would best provide the level of economic literacy needed for adults in today's world. Or, to be more accurate, since the Joint Council has never pushed one particular curriculum, it has sought to help determine those areas in each school system's curriculum where more economics could be included in the classroom without recasting the entire school program. In either case, the Joint Council has become more than an agency that detects an area where change can be made and then helps provide the materials and personnel for effecting the change. It has also organized public support for the change and generated public recognition of successful examples of change. In fact, by becoming a service agency with links to the schools, the community, and the universities, and by developing a network to facilitate curriculum change, the Joint Council may serve as a model for accomplishing such change. It is these two aspects of the Joint Council, its function as a service agency and its role as a model for curriculum, that will be examined in this paper.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND AND FORMATION OF THE JOINT COUNCIL

It was appropriate that the Joint Council was established at the close of the first half of the twentieth century. Many trends of an economic nature had developed in that half century and exerted an influence on many elements of the American society: one of the responses to these trends was to turn to the public school system to encourage and support improved economic education. With this improved economic education the graduates of the public schools were to be better prepared to cope with or change the economic trends of the second half of the century.

The Joint Council was established just four years after the conclusion of the Second World War, a war which greatly altered a number of previously-sacred concepts of the relative roles of government, business and the national economy, and also rearranged the international power struggle. The federal government had played a dominant role in the national economy for only a relatively short time, but in that time had produced too strong an impact to be shrugged away at the end of the war. The ability of the federal government to reduce unemployment and stimulate increased productivity through investment in the economy had been successfully demonstrated. "War Socialism" had been an emergency reaction to an international crisis

situation, though there were some who were concerned that the medicine (increased government involvement) would turn out to be more deleterious to the health of the patient than the illness (the war). Nonetheless, it was patently clear that the role of government in the American economy could well be rethought somewhat as a result of the success of the "arsenal of democracy": did the American people have to suffer depressions if in fact there was some potential for cure in expanded government investment?

The issue of the depression was another factor of some significance in causing a rethinking of economic theory and practice. The stunning business failure seemingly dislocated the public concept of economic order, both at a personal and national level. The high unemployment, the bank closings, the business failures and the agricultural crisis, among many other developments, resulted in an unexpected level of public concern that precluded a return to the practices of the twenties. Among professional economists there was a new theory of economic principles that could support the public concern for economic stability. The "failure" of the old ideas of classical economics was challenged by the new ideas of the Keynesian School, which suggested that an analysis of national income can reveal instances when government intervention can enhance or retard economic growth and increase stability. To combine these two points, not only did the government have a successful record in intervening in the economy, it now had theoretical sanction to continue doing so.

Also suggesting an increased role for government in economic affairs in the post-war domestic scene was the greatly expanded role the United States was called upon to play in the international scene. This international role had been developing for a long time, but the war had certainly set the stage and most of the actors and supporters realized the potential in the unfolding drama. Not only was the United States in 1945 a superpower with incumbent responsibilities, but the only opponent at the time presented an open challenge in areas that were military, political, and economic. The continuing international tension helped feed an increasing awareness that the American people were going to have to allow their federal government to have more power than it had been accustomed to having, and the people themselves were going to have to understand more clearly the nature of the challenge. Since the "rise to the challenge" could be easily warped by emotional, chauvinistic, and even evangelical pressures, pressures which could adversely affect some of the best features of the American way of life, the need for a clearer understanding of politics and economics was even more important.

There were several developments within the economy itself that accounted for an increased complexity, that had resulted from a half-century of dramatic growth and that promised to be the basis for even greater changes in the second half of the century. First, there was the sheer growth of wealth and incomes as the United States came to fulfill its long-predicted potential. More people had more money, and the entire socio-economic unit possessed more wealth than had been

true for any other people in history. Second, there was a remarkable increase in the population, especially in the working-age segment, and this expansion resulted in both a larger market for goods and services and a larger pool from which increasingly-specialized labor could be drawn. Third, not only was the population larger, it became more urban, and the urbanization not only produced greater benefits but also generated more problems, problems with which succeeding generations would have to struggle. Finally, there was rapid scientific and technological change: not only were there entirely new products available to industry and consumer, but the whole production process was dramatically changed.[1]

By 1949, then, there were many new forces acting on the daily lives of the American public. It was a matter of increasing concern among a wide range of concerned government, business, labor and education leaders that the American public required a deeper understanding of these social, political, and economic forces. And it was widely agreed that the public schools would have to play a major role in achieving this goal. And in 1949 the Joint Council on Economic Education was established as one means of achieving increased economic literacy, and its establishment was a culmination of efforts by concerned business, labor, and education leaders.

---

[1]This overview was a summary of the 1961 Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education: Committee for Economic Development, Economic Education in the Schools: Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education (New York: CED, 1961).

Many leaders in the world of business were distinctly unhappy at the threat of increased government involvement in the future national economy, and through such channels as the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers they were disseminating materials to the schools that expressed this concern. But there was one small but significant group that recognized that a new day had dawned, which offered as much potential for good as portent of evil. In 1942, within months after the country was plunged into the world war, a meeting was called by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones. The purpose was to consider the impact on the economy of the termination of government contracts that would come with the end of the war, but some of the businessmen present were convinced that a return to the status quo would not be possible or desirable. Led by such men as Marion Folsom, Paul Hoffman, and William Benton, these businessmen decided to organize themselves to become a voice within the business world calling for a full-employment policy and modern government.[2] They formed the Committee for Economic Development (CED); its constitution pledged it to seek "to develop . . . recommendations for business and public policy which will contribute to the preservation and strengthening of our free society and

---

[2]Karl Schriftgiesser, Business and Public Policy: The Role of the Committee for Economic Development (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), pp. 193-94.

to the maintenance of high employment, increasing productivity and the improvement of living standards.[3]

The CED was to serve many functions. In the field of research and publication it financed several studies by scholars that dealt with the problems of the post-war world, the national economy, and government efficiency, among others. It served as a sounding board for leading businessmen who endorsed the concept of an economic order guided by the doctrine of social responsibility. As such, by indirect influence it tried to help educate the rest of the business community to the changed nature of the American society and the new economic ideas that it was thought would best foster the development of the national economy. It defended the free enterprise system but recognized the reality and vitality of a modified market structure that included an important role for responsible government action and an informed consumer-voter public.

By 1947 the CED was becoming concerned that the generation of students then in school should also learn something of the "new economics" and unlearn some of the old myths still being taught. A joke made the rounds that "the Committee for Economic Development was worried because whole new generations were growing up who could not understand what the CED was talking about."[4] Behind this joke lay a serious concern for

---

[3]Vincent John Fuccillo, "The Committee for Economic Development" (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1969), p. 8.

[4]Schriftgiesser, Role of CED, p. 203.

the economic education then being offered in the schools. In 1947 the CED formed the Business-Education Committee within the organization, and this committee, for six years headed by James F. Brownlee, an investment banker who had played an important part in government service during the war, became a funnel through which funds would pass to the Joint Council as it worked to improve economic education. Itself financed by a large number of corporate contributors, thus freed from undue financial dependency on any single contributor, it served as a model for financial support of the Joint Council while providing a major portion of the funds for Joint Council programs. In addition, many of the trustees of the CED served as trustees of the Joint Council, and through their influence helped attract foundation support to the Joint Council to supplement the funds contributed by the CED.[5]

Another group interested in economic education in the schools during this time was the American Economic Association (AEA). In 1943 the Federal Security Agency of the United States Office of Education published Report Number 15 - Economics, a part of a series called "Adjustment of College Curriculum to War-Time Conditions and Needs," which had been assembled by the AEA. The work on this Report spurred thought on the topic of the undergraduate curriculum and in April, 1944, a Special Committee on Undergraduate Teaching of Economics was established "to undertake a long-run program of study and to report from

---

[5]Fuccillo, "CED," pp. 10-12, 90-92; Schriftgiesser, Role of CED, pp. 204-5.

time to time on various phases of this complicated problem."[6] The work of the Committee was divided, and a Subcommittee on Teaching of Economics in the Schools met in October, 1945. It decided to survey economics instruction across the whole field of the social studies, and Chairman Horace Taylor and Subcommittee Chairman S. Howard Patterson met with Merrill Hartshorn, the Executive Secretary of the National Council of the Social Studies. As a result of this meeting, the committee recommended that the AEA join the National Council as an affiliate, and proposed that a study of teaching in the schools be sponsored and aided by the AEA, the American Political Science Association, the American Historical Association, the American Sociological Society, or by some combination of these.[7]

Neither of these recommendations was accepted by the AEA, but the subcommittee continued its own survey, aided by Hartshorn and J. Laurence Phalan. Phalan, a Specialist for Economics in the Division of Higher Education in the United States Office of Education, had joined the committee and become its Secretary, and in this capacity was preparing an outline for

---

[6] American Economic Association, Report of the Secretary to the Executive Committee, American Economic Review 36 (May, 1946), p. 879.

[7] American Economic Association, "Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching of Economics," American Economic Review 39 (May, 1949), pp. 515-18. With Taylor on the Committee were Paul M. O'Leary, of Cornell; Joseph J. Spengler, of Duke; W. Blair Stewart, of Reed College; and Albert Wolfe, of Ohio State, and the immediate past president of the AEA. With Patterson on the Subcommittee were Harold F. Clark, of Teacher's College, Columbia; Walter O'Donnell, of Ohio State; and Omar Pancoast, of Haverford College.

economic subjects in each social studies area. The survey of schools, begun to get an idea of the background of the college student, soon revealed that the subcommittee was onto a "big thing." They learned that economics was so intertwined with other subjects in the curriculum that it was almost impossible to separate and study the economics alone. Also, the "grass-roots" were calling for help and did not want just another survey. It seemed that educators feared that their students were simply not learning about their economic system, and the subcommittee agreed. Again, in 1949, the committee recommended that the AEA affiliate with the National Council, but again the Executive Committee of the AEA failed to act.[8]

These rejections by the leadership of the Association were partly the result of an awareness that reforming the secondary schools curriculum was a challenging demand for a scholarly group whose perceived interests centered in the institutions of higher learning of the country. The Report of the Special Committee on the Undergraduate Teaching of Economics, published as a supplement of the American Economic Review in December, 1950, was duly concerned with the improvement of instruction in general education and in several specified areas of the college and university curriculum, but did not touch on the problem in the secondary schools.[9] The "big

---

[8]AEA, "Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching of Economics," AER 40 (May, 1950), pp. 619-23.

[9]Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching of Economics, by Horace Taylor, Chairman, AER 40 (December, 1950), pp. 1-17.

thing" was more than the Association was convinced it could handle. In addition there was the even more serious problem of attitude. As Ben Lewis, soon to become the "godfather of the economic education movement," pointed out in 1959:

> Until recently, economics in the schools simply was not accepted by college and university economists as a respectable area of professional concern. Little thought was given to the matter, and the typical attitude was that the less economics taught in the schools, the less economics that would have to be untangled in the colleges.[10]

The attitudes towards the problems of economic education in the schools held by economists of indifference or negativeness was a significant limiting factor against which the Joint Council struggled for the first decade of its existence. However, by sowing such questions as "is economic education adequate in our schools," and "are we doing our part in improving economic education," in the academic community, the subcommittee had prepared the field for the future growth of the economic education movement.

As for the educators themselves, the field hands as it were, there was definitely an awareness that something was amiss in their presentation of economics. Far and away the most important problem was that the typical classroom teacher had grossly inadequate preparation in the subject, with more than

---

[10]Ben Lewis, "Where does the Joint Council Go from Here - As Seen by an Economist?", Education for the Economic Challenges of Tomorrow: Report of a Symposium in Conjunction with the Tenth Anniversary Observance of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Joint Council, 1959), p. 48.

half of the nation's teachers having failed to take even one course in economics while in college. This problem had been considered in the AEA Report, when it described the relative unpopularity of the economics courses that future teachers were expected to take. This unpopularity at least partly resulted from the tendency of the college and university economists to use the introductory courses as the first stage of a weeding-out process, a process which identified those students interested in and capable of becoming graduate students. Thus the general student, whether future teacher or not, was discouraged from even attempting to learn economics.

Because of the poor preparation, or in addition to it, the teacher was not helped by the inadequate materials for teaching economics available at the time, or was confused by the free materials provided by the special interest groups that covered the spectrum of economic opinion and theory. The textbooks available usually stressed consumer education and incorporated little material that was recent in the way of economic theory. Economics instruction was overwhelmingly expository, with little attention paid to analysis or problem-solving.[11] There was a vast amount of material offered the classroom teacher to supplement the textbooks, but virtually all of it was

---

[11] Economics in the Schools: A Report by a Special Textbook Study Committee of the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association, by Paul Olson, Chairman, AER 53 (May, 1963), pp. IX-XII. The Olson Committee was evaluating textbooks at about the same time that the Materials Evaluation Committee was evaluating supplementary materials.

self-serving and biased. Though judicious use of two or more contradictory sources of information could at least help a student identify an area where conflict of interest existed and leave him with some tools of economic analysis so that he could understand better the true economic quality of the conflict, the achievement of these results required a knowledgeable teacher. Far from being knowledgeable, most teachers were as confused as the students and as swayed by personal interests. Thus the aids so willingly offered were often of little educational value.

Of course one corrective would have been to improve the basic textbooks used for classes in economics and to upgrade the economic content of the other textbooks used throughout the curriculum. But here again the problem came full circle: the economists in the colleges and universities were the likely authors, or at least consultants, for such materials, and this was not seen as an adequately rewarding or appropriate use of their time or expertise. The publishers were not convinced there was a market for improved books (after all, where were the courses or teachers to be seen in the schools?), so they did not take it upon themselves to solve the problem of either outdated or ineffective teaching. Closing the gaps between teachers who needed materials, experts who could write them, and publishers who would produce them became one of the goals of the Joint Council.

But among some of the educators, as among some economists and some businessmen, there was, by 1947, an awareness that changes had to be made if the nation was not to produce a

generation of economic illiterates. As G. Derwood Baker told a meeting of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals:

> There is no assurance that youth will acquire the experience and understanding requisite to economic citizenship through the casual contacts of community life. It is essential therefore that educational agencies at all levels give consideration to their responsibility for developing programs of instruction and other experiences which will provide youth and adult citizens with the information, attitudes and competencies which will enable them to function effectively in our society, to the end that we may preserve our freedoms, order our own personal affairs wisely, and contribute to the orderly and progressive development of economic life.[12]

And as Moe Frankel, writing in a Report prepared by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, pleaded:

> Demand for the highly educated man is a consequence of the kind of life we live today. Technological change and increasing complexity are characteristics of our times which require a higher degree of education than ever before on the part of members of our society. We need more professionals, more proficient workers and management, better prepared teachers, more scholars; but above all we need better general education for all our citizens. Today an essential of that better education is for increased economic understanding.[13]

Often, when new realities and new ideas present an opportunity to bring about change, one individual will take the lead and attract others to support him. In this case, the individual was G. Derwood Baker, of the School of Education of New York University. Baker was the coordinator for the initial series of meetings that resulted in the establishment of the

---

[12] G. Derwood Baker, "The Program of the Joint Council on Economic Education, NASSP Bulletin 39 (April, 1955), p. 375.

[13] Moe Frankel, "Educating for the Economic Challenge," Educating for Economic Competence: A Report Prepared by the ASCD Commission on Economic Competence (Washington, 1960).

Joint Council, led the search for foundation, corporate and labor grants with which to finance the Joint Council's activities, and wrote numerous articles expounding the policies and program of the Joint Council. In addition he was the first Director of the Joint Council, a position he held for the first six years of the Council's existence. Born in California in 1899, he received his undergraduate education at Pomona College and became a social studies teacher before entering the field of school administration. He earned his Ed. D. degree from Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1939, and during the Second World War worked as a director and consultant in labor-management negotiations. In 1946 he joined the faculty of the School of Education of New York University.

Through his wartime positions he came into contact with both business and government personnel who were concerned with the problem of economic education in the schools, for reasons already mentioned, and upon joining the faculty of New York University he recognized that many economists and educators shared this concern. During the summer of 1947 he held a series of meetings with representatives from the Committee for Economic Development, from business, from labor, and from education.[14] It was decided to hold a three-week workshop during the summer of 1948, with membership being drawn from as wide a variety of school systems as possible and consultant

---

[14]G. Derwood Baker to M. L. Frankel, 12 September 1975, Joint Council on Economic Education Files, New York. Baker was writing from retirement in California, and described briefly the process of organizing the Joint Council.

help from a wide variety of interested sources. The purpose of the workshop was to be twofold: one, to address the problem of presenting contemporary youth with vital and effective economic education appropriate to the new demands being made on them, and two, to pull together a representative sampling of the national community concerned with the improvement of economic education in the school curriculum with a view to addressing the larger problem of effecting some permanent change. The costs for the workshop were provided largely by the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education, which provided a grant of $85,000 to the Committee for Economic Development to be used solely for the purposes of this meeting. Support also came from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.[15]

This workshop, the prototype for workshops to be held for the next several years, met on August 13, 1948, with representatives from thirty-three city schools, seven state departments of public instruction, and the United States Office of Education. The workshop was housed at Riverdale School for Boys where all the participants lived and worked together for the three weeks duration of the workshop. There were more than twenty consultants available for the sessions; from business (among others, James F. Brownlee, already mentioned in connection with the Committee for Economic Development, and

---

[15]G. Derwood Baker, "The Joint Council on Economic Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology 23 (March, 1950), pp. 387-94. Baker edited the entire issue, which was entitled "Economic Education."

Beardsley Ruml, also a leader of the Committee), labor (Solomon Barkin and David Kaplan), government (Edwin G. Nourse, the first Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, being the most notable figure), the universities (Edward Mason and Roy Blough), and research foundations. The staff, led by Baker, included Cecil Dunn, Professor of Economics at Occidental College; A. D. H. Kaplan, Senior Staff Member of Brookings Institute; Mark Starr, Education Director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; and Sylvia Stone, Assistant to the Research Director of the Committee for Economic Development.[16]

Every morning at 9:15 there was an address by an "expert" from government, labor or business, followed by a question-and-answer session. From 11:00 until noon, group meetings with consultants and participants working together studied more intensively the importance and implications of the topic of the morning. After lunch the pattern shifted to a study of the implications of the topic for education. Committees were organized which considered such areas of economic education as instructional procedures, printed materials and visual aids. After supper there was a repeat of the morning activities, focusing on another topic.[17] Thus there was a heavy emphasis

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 392-93; Joint Council, The Improvement of Economic Understanding: New York University Workshop on Economic Education, 1948 (New York: Joint Council, 1948).

[17] Joint Council, 1948 Workshop, pp. 7-9; Joint Council, Problems of our American Economy: Digests of Presentations at Economic Education Workshops (New York: Joint Council, 1949); Paul W. Harnby, "How Can Economic Education and Understanding be Developed in the Curriculum?", NASSP Bulletin 34 (March, 1950), pp. 140-44. Harnby, a participant in the 1948 Riverdale

on both economic topics and methods for teaching these in the classroom. Before the end of the workshop most of the people involved became convinced that they were onto a good thing: the cooperation of labor, business, research foundations, and government, in combining their efforts with concerned educators, caused them to be more conscious of the immensity of the problem in the schools and of the possibility of a solution. No other activity on this scale (numbers of participants and consultants), scope (almost whole range of economics in the schools), and comprehension (representation from most groups involved in economic activity or education) had been as successful as the Riverdale Workshop. The enthusiastic support of the Committee for Economic Development, and the support from labor and government leadership, helped set the successful tone of the workshop. In addition the quality of the participants was superior: they included the future head of the Joint Council, Moe Frankel, and Albert Alexander of New York City, Martin Essex of Ohio, Therral Heddrick of Michigan, all leaders in local and state education systems.

At the next-to-last session the staff and participants voted that the entire workshop constitute itself as an Interim Committee on Economic Education and elected an Executive Board headed by Baker. The Executive Board consulted with the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the Association for

---

Workshop, spoke at a session of the NASSP annual meeting chaired by Baker.

Supervision and Curriculum Development, as well as with business and labor leaders, before becoming incorporated as the Joint Council on Economic Education on January 22, 1949.[18]

---

[18]Joint Council, Annual Report, 1949; G. Derwood Baker, "Why Economic Education?", High School Journal 37 (November, 1953), pp. 48-54.

CHAPTER 2

THE NETWORK OF AFFILIATED COUNCILS AND CENTERS OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION

The philosophy and program of the Joint Council are displayed in all of the projects in which the Joint Council participates. If it initiates them, the framework for planning and the implementation process itself are shaped to best achieve objectives in accord with the basic philosophy. If it cooperates in a project with other agencies or groups it endeavors to keep the project as close to its philosophy as possible. The Joint Council may be roughly compared to the central nervous system of an organism, which possesses decision-making and message-carrying capabilities. In a very important sense, message-carrying has become the most important role for the Joint Council, as the network of affiliated councils and centers of economic education has developed to become the muscular structure that carries out the major part of the program.

The analogy of the network as an organism is not adequate, however, because of some central components of the underlying philosophy. Because of the conviction that the program is best planned and implemented at the local level, and that it must be supported by a broad range of the economic community, the decision-making aspects of the Joint Council

program have been decentralized from the very beginning. This decentralization is reflected in the name of the organization--the Joint Council. From the outset, the staff of the Joint Council concentrated on building a network of affiliated local councils that could form a service agency for the economic education movement. It was intended that each affiliated council would assess the situation in its own area and would take appropriate actions to achieve the agreed-upon goal of improved economic understanding. It is the existence of the network that marks the Joint Council so distinctively and makes it a potential model for other academic disciplines interested in improving the precollege curriculum.

The network began building within a year of the 1948 Riverdale Workshop. The forces that were pre-existent to the creation of the Joint Council in New York were similarly pre-existent in various parts of the country. In Hartford, Connecticut, the leadership of Paul Coons, the Director of Secondary Education in the city school system, was instrumental in the creation of the Greater Hartford Council for the Advancement of Economic Education, the first local council to affiliate with the Joint Council. In Minnesota, the affiliated council started in 1949 covered the upper midwest but was especially the result of the encouragement of Norman Kearney, the Superintendent of Schools in St. Paul. And in Michigan the effort to improve economic literacy was led by Theral Heddrick of the Kalamazoo city schools. These three educators had all been participants at the first economic education workshop at Riverdale School and carried their enthusiasm back to their city,

state, and region.[1] The number of affiliated councils continued to grow rapidly as the Joint Council staff, from the center organized in New York City and located on the campus of New York University, concentrated much of its effort on building the network.

The experiences already related, in Connecticut, Minnesota, and Michigan, followed one pattern for creating councils. Individuals of ability were brought into contact with the Joint Council through participation in some part of the program and became interested in extending that program into a new area. In the examples cited all three were educators, and all were participants in a workshop. Economists employed as consultants for workshops also began to spread the story of the Joint Council and to work with local educators and local business leaders. Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development or the Joint Council made contact with potential consultants and offered help in organizing community support for the establishment and operation of a local council.[2] In all these examples key persons were at the core of the movement, persons who had already been concerned with instruction in economics in the schools and wanted to play a role in improving it.

---

[1]G. Derwood Baker, "The Joint Council on Economic Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology XXIII no. 7 (March, 1950), 394. The entire issue was edited by Baker and was entitled "Economic Education."

[2]Nolan C. Kearny, "Help for Economics Instruction," Nation's Schools XLII (December, 1948), 44-45. Also, in 1949 a story in the New York Times described the early work done in Iowa.

The development in Illinois provided another pattern. The Joint Council made contact with university personnel at Northwestern University and offered advice and assistance in offering a workshop to Illinois school teachers. William Bradford accepted the offer, and in 1950 the first workshop was held. As had been the case with the Riverdale Workshop in 1948, the participants at the Illinois workshop decided to create a permanent organization for the state. The Joint Council encouraged participants at the initial workshops to organize and carry out the program. Since the workshops were often sponsored by colleges and universities, they also became nuclei for the affiliated councils that were so organized.[3] This relationship of college and university support of in-service education through direct connection to an affiliated council was an integral part of the later Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) project, described in Chapter 3, and still remains an aspect of the centers of economic education.

As shown, key individuals played an influential role in the establishment of councils around the country, providing the interest, enthusiasm, personal skills and motivation necessary for the economic education movement to expand. Unfortunately this positive factor could become a problem if that key individual left the council. Several times operational councils lost momentum after the departure of the person who had started the

---

[3]Joint Council on Economic Education, Annual Report: 1953, For Illinois, William C. Bradford, "History of Economic Education in Illinois," The Councilor XXI (March, 1960), pp. 7-12.

work and offered little more than a holding action after such a loss. Tennessee provides such an example; it went from a vanguard state to one with a moribund program only later reinvigorated. Minnesota dropped off in the late 1950s, but in 1961 revived under the leadership of Roman Warmke and continued to be one of the most effective of the affiliated councils.[4] It was an extra advantage, therefore, for leadership to be identified with an institution. This identification became even more pronounced after 1957, when the first professor of economic education was appointed and specific faculty positions came to be identified with the movement. These institutions and positions still depended on individual ability and commitment but a transfer of interest was made easier.

These individuals could not work in a vacuum but needed to have assistance from groups that were willing to support improved economics instruction. These groups ordinarily included colleges or universities; state or local school systems; and business, farm, financial, and labor organizations. Just as the Joint Council was a coalition of these groups at a national level, so each local council was created from some mixture of them and required their active support to carry out its program. The mix varied from state to state, but the variations were not a result of the exclusion of any segment of the economic community. This was an important and early principle on which the Joint Council based its program. Any

---

[4]There are more examples, but retrogression is the exception rather than the rule.

group that wanted to organize a council on economic education for its city, state, or region and sought affiliation with the Joint Council had to meet certain criteria, and the representation of all segments of the society was crucial. No council failed to meet these criteria, though there has always been an imbalance that favored business and financial representation over that of labor.[5]

The guidelines for establishing an affiliated council gave suggestions for the makeup of the Board of Trustees. Those persons who had expressed an interest in organizing and supporting an affiliated council, to either a school teacher or administrator, a workshop staffer, or another person who had also expressed this interest, were logical candidates to be trustees of the council. The leaders of the organizing council would also try to get the support of high-echelon administrators of large corporations, financial institutions, and farm and labor organizations. A board thus constituted would represent the broad range of the economic interests in the state, and could provide a broad base of financial support for the council activities.

---

[5]Businessmen felt a stronger compulsion to teach "their" system, and also had the financial capacity to support this teaching, so they tended to play a more active role and were more readily called upon by council leadership. This was remarked upon by some council leaders: see article by Robert J. Keller, Dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, in the 18th Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, comparing the support for Minnesota Council with that for the California Council.

The boards would, as stated, have varied mixtures of interests represented on the board, so there were no prescribed patterns. In 1975, of 47 councils in existence,[6] thirty were fully operational to the point of providing continued communications with the Joint Council. The total number of trustees of these councils was 1,346. (Fig. 1) As can be seen, educators comprised the single largest group, but representatives from business and industry and from finance together had a greater percentage. These three categories provided 84% of the representatives on the boards. When the number of councils is divided into the total number of trustees, an average board is seen to have 45 members. (Fig. 2) The boards varied in size from membership numbering in the thirties to the seventies. Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate the overwhelming representation from business, industry, and finance. Numerical strength need not mean special interest influence, and the large number of educators, the influence of the Joint Council, and the integrity of the entire board has kept the network to the principles of non-preferential economic instruction.

Once the factors around which an affiliated council could grow had been brought together, the problem of organizing initial support became one of maintaining continuous growth and expansion. One of the most challenging problems, at both the local and national level, was that of financing the program. There were basically two aspects of this problem: what should

---

[6]By this time the city and regional councils had given way to state councils, so all but three states had an affiliated council.

Figure 1.--Analysis of Boards of Trustee Membership; 30 Affiliated State Councils; By Sector Represented[7]

Sector	Number of Representatives	Percent of Total Representation*
Agriculture	26	2
Business and Industry	419	31
Education	539	40
Finance	178	13
Foundations	5	--
Government	29	2
Labor	70	5
Others	80	6
TOTALS:	1,346	99

*Rounded off to nearest whole number

Figure 2.--The Typical Affiliated State Council Board of Trustees Membership

Sector	Number of Representatives
Agriculture	1
Business and Industry	14
Education	18
Finance	6
Foundations	-
Government	1
Labor	2
Others	3
AVERAGE BOARD MEMBERSHIP	45

[7]Both of the figures reported by George Dawson, Report of Status, Progress, and Improvement of Affiliated State Councils (New York: Joint Council, 1975), p. 56.

be the sources of financial support, and what was the best way to meet the needs of both the Joint Council and the affiliated councils. The problem of financial support for the Joint Council and the affiliated councils, and their projects in the economic education movement at all times placed limits on the extent of the programs they could offer. In economics this is considered the basic problem; resources are scarce relative to the perceived needs for them. The staff and the board of trustees of the Joint Council, economists and educators involved in the in-service and pre-service projects, and members of the economic community in general, who wanted to see increased economic literacy among the American public, were all concerned with the problem of adequate financial support. In the period before the "boom" in college and university spending, before the expansion of the 1960s, the institutions of higher learning were too restricted in their funding to become major sources of financial support, though they steadily increased their contributions. At this time (the late 1950s and the early 1960s) the federal government still played a very minor role in financing education activities in the country. And the nation's economy was not generating enough surplus wealth during this period, in fact was hampered by repeated recessions just as growth seemed about to take place. In short, finances were tight and had to be allocated very carefully.

The Joint Council had begun its existence with support from the Committee for Economic Development and the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education. In 1955 the Fund for Adult Education had given the Joint Council a three-year grant of

$275,000 to support the Cooperating Schools Curriculum Project, and in the same year Resources for the Future, Inc., a Ford Foundation adjunct, gave a grant of $100,000 to support a three-year Conservation and Resource-Use Education Project. The Executive Committee of the Joint Council was continuously involved in enlarging its base of contributor support and making more potential contributors aware of the benefits to be gained from improved economic education. The situation was so serious that just after the Joint Council had a "gala Tenth Anniversary celebration" Frankel reported a shortfall of almost a quarter-million dollars and warned that there might have to be a cut in staff unless more financial support could be found.[8]

The financial problems facing the Joint Council were partly a result of the philosophy on which it operated and partly inherent in any organization dependent on outside support for work from which there is to be no measurable or quantifiable product. There were three major areas in which the problem was most evident. One involved the question of corporate contributions. Here the principle of broad involvement that did not address any special interests created a conflict. If the Joint Council accepted grants directly from large corporate contributors would it in some way be identified with

---

[8]Joint Council on Economic Education, Minutes of the Executive Council, March 10, 1959. The "gala celebration" was held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on November 19, 1958, and featured an address by Arthur Burns, former and future Chairman of the President's Committee of Economic Advisors.

the interests of the contributors? Would it adapt the Joint Council program to satisfy these interests, or, what was more likely, would it be seen as a spokesman or distributor for special interest materials? The Executive Committee and the staff demonstrated too much integrity and concern to permit any "sellout," but they knew they needed to share the quality of Caesar's wife to maintain their leading position in the economic education movement.

In 1956 the Financial Advisory Group of the Board of Trustees had suggested that the Joint Council not seek corporate contributions but continue to pursue foundation support instead.[9] This suggestion was accepted by the Joint Council, but the Executive Committee agreed that the affiliated councils could continue to accept corporate gifts from businesses located within their area of operation. However, at the next meeting the question of corporate contributions was again raised, this time about the propriety of the affiliated councils accepting these.[10] If the Joint Council was concerned about being swayed by special interests, or at least appearing to be in that position, would not the local units be even more likely to be swayed? And even if they were not being swayed but only might be perceived as part of a special interest operation, would that not reflect on the entire Joint Council and its program?

---

[9] Joint Council, Minutes, October 1, 1956.

[10] Joint Council, Minutes, January 10, 1957. The question was raised by David Shephard of Standard Oil (N.J.), which had given $8,000 to the New Jersey Council on Economic Education.

The question of the integrity of the Joint Council, at both the national and the local level, was seen as one of paramount importance.

Another and related problem was that of the occasional competition between the Joint Council and its affiliated councils for contributions from either foundations or corporations. The Joint Council was more likely to attract the contributions of national foundations than any of the various local councils. And small corporations, whose business operations were centered in a single state, were more likely to be attracted to the program of an affiliated council. The conflict lay with the numerous contributors who lay between these two extremes. A corporation or foundation that was approached by a trustee of the national organization would be less interested in also contributing to the support of what might seem to be just smaller parts of the larger whole. It was this conflict that kept the local councils in New Jersey, New York State, and Pennsylvania from expanding their state programs as effectively as would have been expected in states of such economic strength.[11] The Joint Council staff and trustees were constantly reminded of this conflict, especially after annual conferences of field and center directors where problems and programs were discussed were started in 1956. In fact, there

---

[11]The Joint Council also had other potential "competition;" some contributors were dismayed by the flood of requests and suggested a single fund-raising agency for economic education. But the Joint Council trustees decided instead to clarify the Joint Council philosophy to make a more distinct appeal. Joint Council, Minutes, October 29, 1964.

were a few occasions when the Joint Council felt constrained to help some of the affiliated councils for which financial support problems were very severe.[12]

The question of corporate contributions remained a live issue for the Joint Council. In October, 1959, it was decided to solicit "small-amount company foundations" for support where these did not conflict with the fund raising efforts of any affiliated councils.[13] But for the next few years it remained general policy not to turn to corporations for direct support of the general program of the Joint Council. But the American Iron and Steel Institute support of the two regional conferences on economic education in the preparation of teachers opened the door for a new kind of support. This industry-wide foundation was not the same thing as a specific corporate contribution, and its support of a project that the Joint Council originated and directed removed the likelihood of the project being operated in the interests of the contributor.

In 1963 the Committee for Economic Development and the Joint Council agreed to a diminished role for the former in the

---

[12] In 1960 the Joint Council loaned the Michigan council $3,000 repayable over three years; the council was "well organized" but the lack of a full-time director made it difficult to coordinate fund-raising. And in 1964 the Northern and Southern California councils were loaned $10,246 to cover their directors' salaries until the state legislature could approve the necessary legislation. The Joint Council had long been granting financial support to the southern black universities which had been among the pioneers in the workshop program. These were Florida A & M and Fisk University.

[13] Joint Council, Minutes, October 5, 1959. The labor representatives on the board of trustees had been checked in advance and had agreed to this small change in the direction of fund-raising efforts.

financial support of the Joint Council and its program. The Committee had for some time been encouraging the Joint Council to broaden its base of support, so the move was not indicative of a loss of interest on the part of the CED, or a repudiation of the work of the Joint Council.[14] The Ford Foundation had been for some time the major supporter, and that organization also was always eager for the Joint Council to both increase and broaden its financial support. In the early 1960s the major contributors, besides Ford, were the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the AFL-CIO, the Crown-Zellerbach Foundation, the Sidney Hillman Foundation, the W. Alton Jones Foundation, the Oscar Mayer Foundation, the Reader's Digest Foundation, and the Whirlpool Foundation. During the 1960s, as the Joint Council continued to accept large-corporation support for specific projects, major assistance came from Sears-Roebuck, General Electric, and Exxon. Another foundation that played a major role was the Calvin K. Kazanjian Foundation, which was especially interested in the preparation and dissemination of economic education materials.[15]

The affiliated councils did not have access to these large groups, as indicated, but did find support from in-state corporations and foundations. They were unable to attract government support for large-scale efforts, except for schools which were part of the DEEP system (see below, pp. 87-99).

---

[14] Joint Council, Minutes, December 21, 1962 and June 14, 1963.

[15] Joint Council, Newsletter, November 1961, pp. 3-4.

In fact, the securing of public funds has been one of the strong points of the DEEP program. But in most cases, and even in the case of some DEEP schools, the public schools were not able, or willing, to devote significant sums of money to the improvement of economic education. State legislatures, on occasion, required that economics be taught in the schools, usually by means of a single course in the secondary schools, but they rarely voted funds to support this demand.[16] The Joint Council and the affiliated councils were strongly opposed to this method of improving economic literacy. In their opinion the major problem was the lack of qualified teachers; to mandate courses in economics would mean that many classes would be taught by unprepared teachers, a situation hardly conducive to enthusiastic and capable instruction.

An example of one school system that tried to generate local support will demonstrate the fine balance that must be maintained in generating public support which can then be directed to financial support. Miami, Florida, joined the new DEEP project in 1965. The school administration was firmly behind the project, local university support was enlisted, and the faculties of the various schools involved were initially positively responsive. A Committee for Economic Education was

---

[16] In some cases, not economics but "the superiority of the American free enterprise system" has been the required subject. Incomplete investigation indicates that the students in the free enterprise classes do no better at learning economics and the appreciation of the American modified market system than those not under the legislated restrictions, and might even be turned off by the perceived propaganda.

established, and the community business and financial leaders expressed great pleasure in being able to help improve the schools. Unfortunately, a very vocal few were so enthralled that they began pressuring the school board to allot appropriate funds to finance these improvements. The school board was concerned about diverting too large a sum from one part of the curriculum to improve another, and at the same time was unwilling to increase tax rates to secure increased revenue. The Committee had been led into pushing for increased public support, and when this was not forthcoming it began to lose interest in the whole problem of financial support. Thus an opportunity was lost, and funds never did become available in adequate amounts.[17] In 1975, George Dawson of the Joint Council staff, drawing upon the model of "stages of economic growth" suggested by Walt Rostow, described three stages of growth for affiliated councils. One of his criteria for measuring the stage of development was the size of the budget. According to Dawson's criteria, a fully operational, highly effective affiliated council worked on a budget of approximately $75,000; a council building a program worked with approximately $20,000; and one just holding on was limited to $5,000. Using the summaries of the annual reports, submitted that year by 47 councils, he chose $50,000 as a break point. He found that fifteen of the councils (less than a third) enjoyed a budget that large or larger. Ten councils had budgets of between

---

[17] Donald J. Dowd, "A Coordinators Perspective" in Joint Council, DEEP 1969 (New York: Joint Council, 1959), 61-62.

$20,000 and $49,999, and twenty-one, or slightly less than half, made do with less than $20,000. This picture brightened somewhat when only fully-operational councils were considered. In this case of twenty-five reporting, thirteen, or over half, were in the top category; eight, or a third, in the middle; and only four in the lowest category.[18]

How much money was allocated for the improvement of economic education by the Joint Council and the network of affiliated councils and centers? How much of the money that might have gone to some other part of the curriculum was instead directed to improving economic literacy through the program of the Joint Council? The total expenditures of the Joint Council, in 1975, including salaries, wages, office expenditures, and miscellaneous, amounted to $563,141. Added to this should be the annual expenditures of the affiliated councils, an amount totalling $1,439,803, and the special grants of $629,191. Dawson, who compiled the figures here cited, arrived at the imputed costs of the affiliated councils (salaries, wages, office, and utilities) as approximately $840,000, and of the centers for economic education (same general categories) as approximately $1,900,000. The sum total of expenditures for economic education by the Joint Council and its network was therefore

---

[18]Dawson, State Councils, pp. 56-60. In 1975 the affiliated council enjoying the largest operating budget was Arkansas! Led by the remarkable Dr. Bessie Moore, this state council used a budget of $167,000, the only council budget in six digits.

$5,372,835.[19] There were other groups supporting economic education with other amounts of expenditures, but the Joint Council's estimated annual expenditure was by far the most extensive effort. In addition, monies spent by the 300-plus DEEP schools were also an important part of the Joint Council program, and the money spent on DEEP might not be spent on economic education through another project.

The network of the affiliated councils was thus an effective means for channeling funds into the public school curriculum, and of bringing together various supportive groups to work for this improvement. The individual councils were able to benefit from being part of such an extensive network. The breadth and depth of the network, and its national scope, made each affiliated council potentially much more influential than it could have been if it were not part of such a network. There is nothing inherently good or desirable about "giantism," but it can be an asset. Having an affiliated council in every state in the country, the Joint Council's goal for 1980, was an asset in public relations. The communications network that exchanged ideas and information was unique and valuable. This communication was accomplished through the various newsletters published by the Joint Council, but even more through the annual meeting of the National Association of Affiliated Economic Education Directors (NAAEED). The NAAEED had been twenty years in the making. The first conference for workshop and regional

---

[19]Ibid., p. 4.

council directors took place at St. Mary's Lake, Michigan, in the summer of 1955.[20] The first conference held only for field directors, which addressed the situation in the area of council program and development, was held in October, 1958. Thereafter, such meetings were annual events.[21]

The annual meetings accomplished a good deal for the Joint Council and the network directors on both an official and unofficial level. At the official level were workshops and conferences that took place during the four days of the meeting. These dealt with methods and materials for fund-raising, organizing and directing a board of trustees, research and the conduct of further research, and reports on activities and projects that various directors or councils were conducting. At an unofficial level, Joint Council staff and affiliated council personnel traded notes on developments within the network and alerted one another to promising contacts with potential supporters and to students of economics who were likely candidates to become active participants in the economic education movement. These contacts, personal exchanges of shared commitment, represented special features of the program of the Joint Council. For in the role played by these council

---

[20]The plans for the forthcoming conference were discussed at the last Executive Committee meeting Baker chaired before leaving the Joint Council. At that time he said that he felt the council development was progressing sufficiently rapidly and workshops were producing enough competent teachers so that the Joint Council could now consider actual curriculum change. Joint Council, Minutes, May 24, 1955.

[21]Joint Council, Newsletter, May 1959, and November 1959.

directors especially lay the chance for success for the program.

From the very beginning, as already indicated, it was the leadership of key individuals that sparked the establishment of affiliated councils. After the expansion of the first decade, the establishment of new councils was as often the result of contacts initiated by the Joint Council and other affiliated councils with educators and economists as it was of the effort of individuals who asked the Joint Council for help. In either case, the appointment of a full-time executive director for the council became a necessity for successful operation of the council. There were continuous contacts to be made for raising funds; meetings were held with state departments of education and local system administrators, with college and university economists and educators, and with workshop staff; in-service projects required attention and personal contact; and general correspondence with the Joint Council and other councils had to be maintained. George Dawson found that fully-operational councils had a full-time executive director whose salary was usually paid by a college or university. On the other hand, those councils in the very early stages of development had an executive director who held a faculty position but was allowed released time for only half-time work with the council, and those councils that were only marginally operational had an executive director whose work with the council was entirely voluntary.[22] These situations usually, but

---

[22]Dawson, State Councils, pp. 58-60.

not always, had a direct relationship with the length of time of the council's existence. The fully-operational council had generally existed for almost twenty years, allowing for substantial growth to justify a full-time director, whereas the other types of councils had existed for approximately seven years or had come into existence within the past five years, respectively.[23]

In 1956 there were thirty-two affiliated councils, but only nine of these had full-time directors.[24] In 1963, the councils numbered forty-three, of which twenty-three had full-time directors. Thus, almost half of the councils still failed to meet the minimal requirement of a full-time director. Moreover, the forty-three councils were active in only twenty-two states, so that fewer than half of the states enjoyed any affiliated council support for economic education.[25] The Joint Council tried to impress upon those councils that had only a part-time director the necessity of bringing about a change. As more and more colleges and universities began cooperating with the Joint Council, more students became aware of the economic education movement and were motivated to be a part of it. Students at institutions that established centers of economic education were exposed to the program of the Joint

---

[23]There was no strict pattern but the generalization is accurate enough and reflects the importance of full-time direction.

[24]JCEE, Annual Report: 1956.

[25]JCEE, Joint Council on Economic Education: Goals, Program, Future (Unpublished memo, Joint Council on Economic Education, 1963).

Council and the affiliated councils, with which the centers maintained the closest contact, and, as the number of centers increased after the mid-1960s, so did the number of students who learned about economic education. As the demand for capable and motivated leaders for affiliated councils grew, so did the supply. By 1976, Frankel could report to the Executive Committee on the progress that was being made in attracting qualified persons to be part of the Joint Council network. He pointed out that "young and able council and center directors are taking over the reins, and these directors have made career choices in favor of economic education, fully realizing the interdepartmental difficulties in such a choice."[26]

Having looked at the problems of organizing and financing an affiliated council and the manner in which the councils put into practice the principle of local control of non-special-interest instruction of economics, it is appropriate to examine some of the projects in which the councils were involved. The two general areas of operations were involvement with Joint Council-directed projects, and individual council-directed projects that dealt with pre- and in-service preparation of teachers, curriculum projects, materials preparation, and publicity for economic education. The role of the local council in supporting Joint Council-directed projects was well summarized by John Coleman as he was describing the potential of the television course, The American Economy:

---

[26]Joint Council, Minutes, July 23, 1976.

> I suspect that the communities from which we will continue to draw the best evidence of a localized impact from the television course are those where affiliates of the Joint Council on Economic Education are most active. These active affiliates patiently and imaginatively worked at the task of promoting enough advance interest among the teachers in their area to ensure a follow-through once the series began. . . . They perform for this new course the same functions that an established college's catalogue, reputation, and information-service perform for its academic offerings.[27]

Not only did the local councils support the nationwide television course, but several produced their own television materials. Minnesota, for instance, produced a 305-page study guide in 1965 for use with the series, and in 1975 received a National Science Foundation grant to produce teacher guides and hold in-service workshops to prepare teachers to use Adventure: Economics and Adventure: Environment, two series it had produced.[28] The same kind of cooperation was achieved with the Cooperating Schools Project from 1955-58, and the DEEP Phase I project from 1964-67: in both cases cooperating schools were selected where effective local council involvement was available. This support was seen then as being essential if these projects were to be successful.[29]

The program of the Joint Council could not have been carried out as effectively as it was without the support of

---

[27]John Coleman, "Economic Literacy: What Role for Television?" American Economic Review 53 (May, 1963): 650.

[28]Minnesota Council on Economic Education, Annual Report: 1975, pp. 3, 9.

[29]It was also discovered that, as full-time and competent Executive Directors were essential to the success of the affiliated councils, so too was the DEEP coordinator for the local system the crucial ingredient for success.

the affiliated councils, but of even greater importance was the individual work done by the local councils. Through that work, a multiplier effect was generated for improving economic education. Not only was there a national program carried out through the local councils, but also each council generated its own support for its own local program. The basic program for the local councils was described in the proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary celebration of the Joint Council.[30] Each council was the sponsor of in-service workshops, bringing together educators, economists, and curriculum specialists for the purposes of training teachers, developing new materials, and improving the instruction of economics in the curriculum. The in-service workshops were a minimum state program; councils that were too poor, too new, or too weakly directed at least held workshops, even if more extensive programs were beyond their reach. These in-service projects lasted a day (21 councils had 68 of these in 1975), two days (24 councils had 61 of these), from three to five days (11 councils had 21 of these), or two or more weeks (these were workshops proper, and in 1975, 31 councils offered 191 workshops during the academic year, and 40 councils offered 94 summer workshops).[31]

---

[30]Joint Council, Education for the Economic Challenges of Tomorrow: Report of a Symposium in Conjunction with the Tenth Anniversary Observance of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Joint Council, 1959), pp. 23-29.

[31]Dawson, State Councils, pp. 35-37. One of the earliest institutions holding workshops was Fisk University in Nashville, which received almost no support from a then-active Tennessee council. Every year until 1962 the Joint Council made a grant to Fisk, and to Florida A & M, to carry on the program.

All told, the affiliated councils offered 435 in-service projects in 1975, with a total attendance of 20,163 teachers. However, the number was a small segment of the total population of eligible teachers, and in addition is somewhat misleading. Of the 20,163 participants, just a little over half attended the longer workshops; a quarter of the total had only a single-day seminar, and the others from two to five days. When studies show that at least fifteen semester hours of economic instruction are necessary for an understanding of economics adequate for teaching, these figures are not as impressive as might have been hoped for. They do demonstrate the incremented gains that had been made, gains that probably would not have been possible without the Joint Council, but that nevertheless were still short of the goal of a fully-qualified teaching profession.

Affiliated councils also worked directly with local systems in improving their curriculum. This was especially significant in the work with the DEEP schools after 1964. The Joint Council contracted to support fully three pilot school systems for three years, and aid substantially twenty-seven model school systems for the same length of time. The affiliated councils in California, Minnesota, and Western Pennsylvania supplemented the Joint Council funds, and helped organize the framework of institutional and community support that was so vital to success. After Phase II of DEEP began in 1967, the councils played an even more direct role. When any school expressed an interest directly to the Joint Council in participating in the DEEP program, this information was passed on to the affiliated council of that state. The school itself

was congratulated for its commitment to improved education and was then referred to the affiliated council and its director. In addition, affiliated council directors themselves made direct contacts with other school systems which they felt would be interested in the DEEP program. These systems had been identified through contacts made at workshops or other professional meetings, or through suggestions from faculty members of nearby colleges or universities who expressed an interest in supporting economic education in the schools. Here again the highly visible profile of the Joint Council among economists (through its relationship with the American Economic Association), educators (especially through the National Council for the Social Studies and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), and school administrators (through the ASCD and the National Association of Secondary-School Principals), helped the affiliated council draw upon a wide range of supporters, while the service arm of the network actually carried the national program at the local level.

The in-service and curriculum projects mentioned above brought the councils into direct contact with the schools and their teachers and students. Other activities in which they engaged supplemented these direct contacts. In the 1970s these activities were increasingly performed under the direction of the centers of economic education that had been established at colleges and universities within the state. One important activity was research in economic education. The research projects varied widely, some evaluating the effectiveness of materials, others of methods of instruction, others of the gains

in teacher performance made through in-service workshops. This research was disseminated through the Journal of Economic Education, through seminars at the annual meeting of council and center directors, or as a result of written requests. Thus a body of literature was rapidly accumulating from which further research might be conducted and refinements made in the process of evaluating economic education.

Another area of council activity was the publication of research and curriculum materials. Again, there was a wide variety of published materials produced by the affiliated councils. Some involved problems or situations unique to a given area. This followed an example set by one of the earliest councils in the network, the Greater Hartford Economic Education Council in Connecticut, which produced materials on the economic picture of that community that the Joint Council made available to the nation's schools. Other publications offered suggestions for implementing economic education through various techniques, or through the use of materials that had been developed by a particular council, or by one of the centers related to the council. The published materials that the affiliated councils provided to the school systems supplemented the work done to prepare teachers to use these materials. The local autonomy ensured that issues of local importance, addressed by educators or economists attuned to local needs, would be treated in these publications, thereby making them more relevant and possibly more acceptable to the local school systems.

As of 1975 there were 46 state councils, and the goal was for every state to have one by 1980. If that goal could be

reached, a victory both symbolic and actual would have been achieved in this central part of the program of the Joint Council. The network of service agencies would be complete. But significant problems would remain: the organization of a network, though a prerequisite to any substantial improvement and growth, would not be the final answer to the problems. Any shortcoming in leadership could bring about a pause or possibly a slippage in the efforts of the Joint Council. And the question of finances would remain crucial. Dependent on voluntary financial support, the Joint Council and the affiliated councils were "victims of the marketplace." Improving economic education in the schools also required commitment by school administrators and teachers that might be diverted to other areas of the curriculum.

The other major element in the network began to play a part in 1956 and took about ten years to achieve significance. In that year the first Center of Economic Education was established on the campus of the University of Iowa. In 1963 there were still only fifteen centers on campuses around the United States. After the first conference of center directors in Atlanta in 1965, and after the Joint Council published a handbook for establishing and operating a center, there was steady growth in the number of institutions participating. Although the most rapid growth in this aspect of the Joint Council's program took place in the latter half of the 1960s, the first efforts in the mid-1950s set a pattern. These centers became the institutional links between the scholarly expertise and capability of the colleges and universities, and the local

school systems. They helped train teachers through in-service projects, worked with departments of economics to improve their courses in economics and with education departments to expand the teaching of economics in teacher-preparation courses, and performed research and publication functions.

The reasons for having centers of economic education became more apparent as the network of the Joint Council expanded in size and as faculty members of more colleges expressed more interest in the program. It was felt that a center located on a college or university campus could be an "action point" to which interested people could go to get or offer help. In larger and more populous states, several centers were desirable for this purpose. On the campus the center could act as a "coordination center" between the economics and education departments, and off campus could facilitate cooperation between the college and the local schools, and the education system and the community it serves. The existence of an institution such as a center offered continuity to an economic education program, as the center could outlast, or outlive, a faculty leader. Also, the center could draw upon faculty expertise to conduct and evaluate a research program beyond the capability of the local school system. Finally, as an enticement to the host institution, the center could serve a public relations purpose and possibly even be a source of additional financial support for other school programs.[32]

---

[32]Joint Council, Center for Economic Education (Revised Edition), pp. 3-6. The material for this handbook was drawn from a suggested handbook prepared for the 1965 Atlanta meeting

The Joint Council prepared a handbook to serve as a guide for the operation of centers. Because of the nature of college and university administrations, a specific-function center on a college campus ought to have clear lines of authority. The program of the center for economic education located on a college campus must be broad and varied, and the center must stress an interdisciplinary approach in the college community, but the work of the center must concentrate entirely on economic education. For this purpose, the director's duties need to be clearly outlined, as must those of the staff. This should reduce the extra claims on the time of the staff or the director. The center should also have a separate budget: the support from the host institution should be accounted for by the center, and the center should be responsible for this accounting. But any outside grants or contributions should be separate from the institution's accounts, and these funds should be substantial if the center is to be successful.[33]

From the very beginning, a common pattern seems to have been followed for getting a center started into operation. The key figure was usually a professor who became interested in economic education. This interest often came through personal contact at a professional meeting, the reading of an article on economic education, requests of a local or state school system for help, or the encouragement of an affiliated council director. An exciting breakthrough for the Joint Council came

---

by Sidney Kronish, Norman Townshend-Zellner, Lewis Wagner and Roman Warmke.

[33]Ibid., pp. 23-27.

in 1964, when Glenn Dumke, Chancellor of the California State Colleges, and long an associate of the Joint Council, announced his intention of having a center on every campus in the system.[34] This commitment from the state leadership thrust California to the top of the movement to establish centers for economic education on college campuses. A meeting in Atlanta the following summer produced a handbook for establishing and operating a center, which provided some of the guidelines already described. The Atlanta meeting was substantially helped by a grant from the Young President's Organization, an organization which had already contributed to the Joint Council program in other ways.[35]

The American Bankers Association, through its Foundation for Education in Economics, granted $250,000 to the Joint Council in 1965, all to be used for the purpose of establishing a hundred new centers in the following five years.[36] The rapid expansion of the network of centers was directly related to this grant, which the ABA renewed in 1970. In 1968 the Economic Education Committee of the ABA recommended to the membership that the Association work even more closely

---

[34]Joint Council, Minutes, January 31, 1964.

[35]Joint Council, Minutes, February 11, 1960. The Executive Director of the YPO was formerly the Executive Secretary of the New England Council on Economic Education. The YPO had helped with support for the National Workshop for Business Education Teachers, which had been held in the summer of 1959.

[36]Joint Council, Annual Report 1965, p. 2. The meeting in Atlanta addressed the problem of which institutions might be most appropriate as locations for these centers.

with the Joint Council and the affiliated councils. It was recommended that regional meetings be held at which interested bankers and council directors could explore ways in which the Association, or individuals, could support the Joint Council and its program. As the Joint Council pointed out in its newsletter, banks were everywhere under the direction and operation of persons who were community leaders, thus presenting the affiliated councils with a great opportunity for support.[37]

This period of "beginnings" and growth of the center, which began in 1964 with the California centers, culminated in the first annual meeting of center directors, which was held on the campus of Ashland College, Ohio, in 1969. The center directors' meetings shared the purposes of the annual meetings of the affiliated council directors. Also in 1969, the first workshop was held for center directors. It met at Carnegie-Mellon University under the direction of Philip Sanders, and was financed by a grant from the General Electric Company.[38]

Despite the extensive preparation by the Joint Council before a center is established, there was no guarantee of a continuing relationship between the center, the host institution, and the Joint Council or the affiliated council. A center could be, and several were, dropped from active participation in the Joint Council program. Usually that action resulted from a drop in support by the host institution. As of January,

---

[37]Joint Council, Newsletter, May 1968, p. 5.

[38]Joint Council, Newsletter, February 1969, p. 4.

1977, there were 147 active centers in the network, and thirteen had been dropped from the network. Of the thirteen, one had been reinstated to an active role, and another had been reinstated but then dropped again after three more years of effort. One of the thirteen was dropped by an affiliated council director.[39]

The programs of the 147 centers active at the beginning of 1977, though serving the interests and needs of their states or localities, had many of the characteristics of the affiliated council and the Joint Council itself in that some had more capable directors than others, had more or less support from concerned individuals or groups, or benefited or suffered from any of a wide variety of influences. A sample program of one center, nonetheless, presents a fairly representative image. In the College and University Newsletter of Spring, 1973, and in the network newsletter Progress in Economic Education of March, 1975, the Joint Council publicized the activities of a new center, in both cases the Center at the University of Delaware which had been established in September, 1972, under the direction of James B. O'Neill. The purpose of the Joint Council in outlining the activities of the new center was "to point out to other center directors what can be done at a

---

[39] Joint Council, Directory of Affiliated Councils and Centers (single-page foldout). Affiliated Councils might also develop a special association with a college or university, without that association being so formalized as to become a center recognized by the Joint Council.

center in a relatively brief period of time."[40] These were words both of encouragement and advice.

The director of the Delaware Center visited all twenty-three school districts in the state to introduce them to the services the Center could offer in introducing or improving the teaching of economics. Twice a year newsletters were published to establish communication with teachers and administrators. A course, Economics for Secondary Teachers, was offered every year at the Center, with graduate credit. Six months after the establishment of the Center, a statewide one-day DEEP meeting was held at the Center to which came representatives from twenty-two of the twenty-three districts. A one-week workshop was held in one of the school districts in the summer of 1972, and a resource center was organized to enable teachers to examine some of the more recent economic education materials and curriculum packages in social science education.[41] A long-range project that the Center undertook was the testing of economic understanding of selected students in United States history, world history, and economics courses, with the purpose

---

[40] Joint Council, College and University News, Spring 1973, pp. 1-2.

[41] A resource library was of utmost importance at the centers, and the Joint Council offered both assistance and guidance in creating one. To every new center the Joint Council sent one of every item offered for sale on its biannual Checklist. These included the pamphlet Suggestions for a Basic Economic Library, the Reports of the Materials Evaluation Committees, and the listing of 1200 research projects compiled by Laurence Leamer and updated annually by the Joint Council's College and University Director. The Centers were also referred to the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress, and the List of Free Materials available to college professors, distributed by the Wall Street Journal.

of gathering data regarding the status of the teaching of economics in secondary social studies classrooms in Delaware. Data were also gathered on individual teachers in order to gain some idea of the competence of teachers for imparting economic understanding. Finally, the Center was selected by the Joint Council to analyze the economic content in United States history and world history textbooks, under a grant from the Sears-Roebuck Foundation. This latter project was not directly related to the program for Delaware, but indirectly assisted local systems in evaluating and selecting textbooks. In addition to these projects related to secondary education, the Center was actively involved with elementary and middle schools and teachers, and also designed an experimental approach to the introductory economics course taught at the University of Delaware.

Other centers were pursuing other general or specific projects. Some were local in origin and content, others were related to Joint Council projects and grants, and still others were part of substantial national projects. The National Science Foundation in 1975 gave four major grants to members of the Joint Council network that totalled $11.5 million. Two grants went to state councils: one to the Delaware Council to continue the program of the Center at the University of Delaware just described, and one to the Minnesota Council, which was preparing teaching guides for, and disseminating information about, two television series which it had produced.[42] The

---

[42]Minnesota Council on Economic Education, Annual Report

other two major grants went to two centers of economic education: the Center at St. Cloud University, Minnesota, was helping central Minnesota elementary schools develop and implement social studies and economic education curriculum materials, and the Center at the University of Missouri at Columbia was developing a telephone-TV-radio format for colloquia to improve economic education.[43]

The numbers of centers increased tenfold in the decade from 1965-76. There were no absolute limits to the number of centers that might be established in each state. Factors to be considered by the affiliated councils and the Joint Council included the following: the number of institutions interested in and capable of hosting a center on their campuses, the number of DEEP schools located in the state that could be serviced by the centers, the strength and support of the affiliated council. In 1975 the California Council on Economic Education had the largest number of centers associated with the economic education program (ten), followed by Indiana and Wisconsin (eight each), Illinois, Texas, and Utah (seven each), and Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio (six each). On the other hand, ten of the councils had no centers in association with their program, seven had only one, and six

---

1975, p. 3. The two series were Adventure: Economics, and Adventure: Environment.

[43]The Director of the University of Missouri-Columbia Center was the former Assistant Director of the College and University Program of the Joint Council.

only two.[44] There was no automatic correspondence between the number of centers in the affiliated council program and the quality of the program: Delaware had only one center but the program in that state was considered one of the finest. Nevertheless, about half of the councils accounted for only 15% of the centers, whereas the "top ten" accounted for almost half the total. This imbalance was unsatisfactory for carrying out a broadly effective program, but it was likely to be self-corrective. Those states with a large number of centers would be reaching a "saturation point" while newly organized or revitalized councils would be expected to gain more support from colleges and universities in their states as they developed their program.

The network of the affiliated councils and centers was thirty years in the making. The emphasis in the first ten years was on expanding the program to include any areas or regions which expressed an interest in economic education. After the National Task Force Report in 1961 and the American Economy television program of 1963-64, the newly-acquired recognition and support was especially directed towards the development of new projects and new materials. These developments were occurring during the same time as the other social science and natural science disciplines were directing their attention to the improvement of instruction in the nation's schools. This general wave of interest crested in the late 1960s and began

---

[44] Dawson, State Councils, pp. 22-29.

receding in the early years of the 1970s. It was during these years, however, that the Joint Council was able to establish an affiliated council in almost every state, and to bring about a tenfold expansion in the number of centers of economic education. The job opportunity offered by a directorship of either a council or a center was causing increased numbers of graduate students to make career decisions that favored working in the economic education movement. Opportunities for disseminating ideas and information were made possible through the Joint Council; these opportunities were provided by the annual council and center director meetings, the numerous summer or school-year workshops, the Journal of Economic Education, and by sessions at professional or academic meetings. These contacts ensured that research programs were developed and examined, and as a result a body of knowledge was gradually being drawn together.

CHAPTER 3

THE PROGRAM OF THE JOINT COUNCIL: IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

In 1947 when Baker was considering the best course of action to follow in addressing the problem of economic illiteracy a large workshop seemed to offer the best solution. Three weeks of concentrated work can achieve substantial understanding of topical material and, if this was set as a purpose, some initial work on methods of and materials for teaching of the subject. There can be enough time for participants, staff, and consultants to develop a sense of community of interest that can long outlive the actual period of the workshop. And for those providing the financial support a cost-benefit analysis looks promising: not so long as to be too expensive, not so brief as to be quickly finished and "out of mind." All of these factors were working favorably in late summer of 1948 at the Riverdale Workshop, with the help as already mentioned of an unusually competent cast of participants, staff, and consultants. At the 1949 spring meeting of the National Business-Education Conference of the Committee for Economic Development, Baker reported on the workshop of 1948, and the incorporation of the Joint Council in January, and the plans

for more workshops in the coming summer.[1] Another national workshop was to be held at Riverdale, and regional workshops were to be held in Minnesota and Michigan. In 1950 there was another workshop in each of these three locations, and for the first time they were held in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

These first workshops all demonstrated the ripple effect that the Joint Council was to generate and cultivate successfully. Participants in the Riverdale Workshop of 1948, already aware of the need for improved economic education in their schools, went home with a "sense of mission" and an example of how support might be generated in the local systems. The University of Minnesota and Michigan State College were approached by Riverdale participants from those two states: they were asked to provide the location and the staff for local workshops similar to the national one in New York.[2] When this support was achieved the curriculum directors of the local systems, as well as college and university leaders, could ask for state or community support. The combined appeal of public school systems and state colleges and universities made a strong impression on the potential contributors. In addition there were two other voices asking for help and support.

---

[1] "Economists and Business Leaders Meet," New York Times, March 5, 1949, sec. 1, p. 20; Schiftgriesser, CED, pp. 204-5.

[2] Joint Council, Annual Report 1950; G. Derwood Baker, "The Joint Council on Economic Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 23 (March, 1950), pp. 394-95. The entire March issue of the Journal was edited by the Joint Council.

Trustees of the Joint Council and of the Committee for Economic Development wrote letters to local groups or persons they knew, either personally or professionally, and encouraged them to aid at the state level what the trustees were aiding at the national level. And the staff of the Joint Council, especially the Director, approached key businesses, labor unions, farm organizations, and other groups that might be sources of support, pointing out the growing national movement to improve economic education and the need for funds to train teachers and to produce good materials.

From the very beginning, then, the Joint Council carried out its philosophy of local direction and funding for programs designed by professional educators to provide impartial and academically sound experiences for the improvement of economic education. The response was enthusiastic: from three workshops held in the first summer of its existence, the number increased steadily, to nine in 1950, fourteen in 1951, twenty-four in 1952, and thirty-one in 1953, after only five years of effort.[3] For the first decade of the Joint Council's existence these workshops were a central part of the national program; with turnover in the teaching corps fairly low and the schools experiencing only moderate growth, the workshops provided effective ways to reach at least the most highly-motivated or interested teachers. This trend changed beginning in the late 1950s, and until the early 1970s the

---

[3]Jount Council on Economic Education, Annual Report 1954.

passing through of the baby-boom generation caused the teaching profession to be greatly enlarged, at the same time that teacher turnover increased rapidly. For these reasons, the workshop movement was not able to hold its own in improving the economic teaching skills of the nation's teachers.[4] The Joint Council did not drop in-service workshops from its program during this period, but was able to expand the program to cope with the problem in other ways, which will be described later. In the mid-1970s, with the teaching profession stabilizing and fewer new teachers being trained, the workshop movement recovered some of its earlier importance in the program.

At first, participation in the state workshops was dependent on the interest expressed by the individual teacher. The Joint Council encouraged local councils to encourage schools and universities to provide workshops, and local educators, usually after some contact with the Joint Council, provided the same encouragement "from the bottom." It was then up to the individual teacher to take advantage of the opportunity. Those teachers who participated in the workshops were usually motivated and concerned to fill out their often-meager knowledge of economics and to learn how to teach it. As already noted, these people often returned to their communities to interest

---

[4]E. G. Wallace, "The Preparation of High School Teachers of Economics," Journal of Economic Education, 2 (Spring, 1970), p. 71. Wallace pointed out that only 1 percent of the social studies teachers had attended economic education workshops in a profession with an annual turnover rate of 8 percent and a growth rate of from 2.8 to 4.5 percent. These figures were from studies reported in the late 1960s.

other teachers or community leaders in improving economic education in the schools. But there was not a sound basis for building a system of improved education: there was virtually no way to ensure that enthusiasm yielded increased awareness on the part of others, no way to build a continuing program of economic education in the schools, and not enough opportunity to offer extra continuing help to those workshop "graduates" who wanted and needed it.

The situation in Illinois offered a good example of how the problem was met. As was true of the Joint Council itself, and of many of the other states where the economic education movement was beginning to develop, the workshops in Illinois were a result of the special efforts of one man. William C. Bradford, Assistant Dean of Faculties at Northwestern University, responded to a suggestion by the Joint Council and organized a workshop that was held at Northwestern in 1951.[5] Sixty-eight persons attended and voted to organize an Illinois Council on Economic Education. Bradford was the first Executive Director, and the Council was soon active enough to warrant the services of a full-time Field Director. At the second workshop, held in 1952 at Lake Forest Academy, the participants drew up a petition to the Illinois Curriculum Program for affiliation with that organization. This was accepted in 1953. With this expansion, those working for economic education could work more

---

[5]William E. Bradford, "Program Carried Out--in Workshops," The Councillor, 21 (March, 1961), pp. 16-18.

closely with the leaders of curriculum development in the state, and avoid being just another outside pressure group advocating only its own special interests. In 1955 another workshop in the state was held at Bradley University; in 1956 yet another was added at Milliken University; and in 1958 two more, at Southern Illinois University and Augustana College, brought the total in the state to five.[6]

Beginning with the Northwestern University workshop in the summer of 1954, the Illinois Council approached selected school systems and asked them to send to the workshop teams of teachers and administrators from all three levels, elementary, junior- and senior-high schools. Thus there would be more commitment to changing the curriculum to improve economic education, as system administrators could provide overall guidance and assistance, and the change could be instituted over the whole range of each system, K-12. The workshops were reduced from three to two weeks, and instead of attempting to produce materials at the workshop, with inadequate teacher preparation and deadline pressures, the staff selected an inventory program and addressed itself to specific areas of weakness in the economic understanding of the participants. Each summer there were about five or six teams from school systems, each consisting of from six to eight members: in the first six years over twenty school systems received this in-depth treatment. This refinement in the workshop format, started by Illinois, was

---

[6]William E. Bradford, "The History of Economic Education in Illinois," The Councillor, 21 (March, 1960), p. 9.

quickly adopted by other state councils, as the Joint Council was able to make use of its network of councils in two ways.[7] First, it reported on the Illinois workshops in its Newsletter, and all subscribers could become familiar with the basic outline. Second, the Joint Council revised its handbook for workshop format to include this new procedure, and the councils could draw upon this more detailed source. And of course there was the informal network of meetings and discussions that the Joint Council offered as a forum for the exchange of ideas.

The change in workshop format may have been influenced by the results of a testing program undertaken at the University of Iowa. In 1953 the staff of the Iowa Workshop on Economic Education, led by Lewis E. Wagner, prepared a Background-Development Test of ninety-one multiple-choice items, sixty-nine of which covered economic content while the remainder attempted to assess attitudes about economics. They sent the test to all workshops, and six of the thirty-one responded. Of 1,385 teachers in the thirty-one workshops, 157 in the six that responded took the test. Thus 19.4% of the workshops responded and 11.3% of all participants were tested. These are not large numbers or high percentages, but they are adequate for some evaluation of the economic understanding of the teachers who took the test. The tests were given twice,

---

[7]William E. Bradford, "The Program of the Joint Council--in Workshops," in Education for the Economic Challenges of Tomorrow: A Report of a Symposium in Conjunction with the Tenth Anniversary Observance of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Joint Council, 1959), pp. 15-16.

the first time at one of the earliest sessions and a second time at the next-to-last session: there was no indication given that there would be a second test, and as far as was possible the workshop did not "teach the test." The results were uniformly discouraging. With four possible answers, random guessing alone would give each question at least a 25% chance of being answered correctly. On the first test, there were 30% of the questions (twenty-one in number) to which less than 25% of the teachers knew the right answer, and 60% (forty questions) to which 50% or fewer of the teachers knew the right answer. On the second test there was some improvement, as there were now 23% of the questions to which less than a quarter of the teachers knew the right answer, and 40% to which half or less knew the right answer. In other words, there was some improvement but the final results were still not much better statistically than if the teachers had only made wild guesses.[8]

Though limited in scope, these results were startling enough to cause some re-evaluation. The test revealed three areas in which teachers demonstrated relative competence, these being (1) foreign trade, (2) inflation, and (3) problems of economic stability. On the other hand, three areas most often missed concerned (1) resource allocation, and the most basic economic problem of scarcity of resources, (2) money and banking,

---

[8]Lewis E. Wagner, "Testing Economic Knowledge and Attitudes," NASSP Bulletin, 40 (May, 1956), pp. 120-32. This article was condensed from a pamphlet published by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of the University of Iowa.

and (3) the nature and scope of economic analysis. Wagner offered three basic conclusions from the evaluation of the test results. First, the test indicated very poor teacher preparation in the content of economics: any workshop that brushed up content quickly and then spent much time on teaching techniques would find that it was attempting to build castles on quicksand. Second, this error would be compounded if time was spent in drawing up classroom materials, because the unprepared teacher could hardly be expected to produce material of any true quality. Third, content of economics had to be emphasized more in the workshops, with more time spent on the weaker areas of micro-economics and economic analysis and less time on the better understood area of macro-economics.

Wagner did see at least three important gains that could be accomplished through the use of the workshop. If the participants acquired a sense of humility from their recognized "ignorance" of economics and their unpreparedness, then they might be motivated to follow the suggested guidelines for continued improvement and become more knowledgeable about the subject. Second, it was extremely beneficial to discuss these problem areas and economics materials with the experts who would be available at a workshop, with the proviso that the experts not "talk down" to the teachers. Finally and maybe most importantly, and certainly in line with one of the key goals of the Joint Council, it provided an occasion for labor, business, economist, and educator to sup at the same table, without assessing any blame or promoting any special interests.

By 1953 the Joint Council had set the general pattern of workshop organization and preparation. There were two-day planning conferences held in four cities where summer workshops were to be located, at which projected workshop personnel and Joint Council staff worked out programs for the workshops.[9] The Joint Council had already published several pamphlets and handbooks that outlined a format and recommended topics for consideration, and suggested sources that could be called upon for consultant help. These publications were distributed to the affiliated councils and to any persons who asked the Joint Council for assistance, and given out at professional meetings by trustees and staff members to prospective enlistees in the movement.[10] The publications and conferences helped establish the general pattern, and the practical advice helped generate support among both prospective workshop staffers and participants. Yet there was adequate flexibility, as the reaction to the Iowa test showed, and as increased experience and research indicated areas for improvement. The

---

[9]Joint Council, Annual Report 1953. The cities where the conferences were held were San Francisco, Chicago, Nashville, and New York.

[10]Joint Council, The Improvement of Economic Understanding: New York University Workshop on Economic Education, 1948 (New York, N.Y.). Also from the Joint Council, Digests of Presentations at Economic Education Workshops (New York, 1949), and Recommended Scheduling and Content for Three-Week Economic Education Workshops (New York, 1952). A perennial favorite from the first workshop was the address entitled "Problems of Our American Economy" and given by Edwin Nourse, the first chairman of the first President's Council of Economic Advisors. This address was featured in the November, 1953, issue of Social Education which was devoted entirely to the topic of economic education and was edited by the Joint Council.

1954 Evaluation Study of the Joint Council, commissioned by the Board of Trustees, criticized the Joint Council for not allowing the participants enough voice in the operation of the workshops and said that the workshops were too "static." At the annual Board meeting in November, 1954, the Board and staff discussed the Evaluation and then broke into working groups to address some of the critical points raised. As a result of this meeting another guideline was published in 1955 that was much more flexible and that encouraged more round-table discussion.[11]

As the number of affiliated councils increased, and as they took on more and more in-service projects such as the workshops, the direct involvement of the Joint Council became increasingly limited. Flexibility was a necessity in a service system comprised of locally autonomous units, each of which faced a unique variety of problems and opportunities, and this flexibility was accepted by most supporters of economic education. But as late as 1964 it was felt that there was still an inadequate understanding of what constituted an effective workshop. Several members of the Field Directors' Advisory Board met with the staff to work on this problem, which entailed striking a happy balance between enough structure to accomplish established goals and enough flexibility to adjust

---

[11]Sherman Gould, Evaluation Study of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1954). Also Joint Council, Minutes, September 24, 1954, and November 8, 1954.

to any situation changes.[12] Despite the difficulty of achieving this balance, and of achieving the balance of economics instruction and materials production, workshops continued as a major part of the Joint Council program. In 1970 the Joint Council estimated that 2,500 teachers attended economic education summer programs, and in 1973 it was estimated that 42,000 teachers had attended more than 1,000 workshops in the quarter-century since the initial workshop at the Riverdale School.[13]

Many motivating factors were behind attendance at summer workshops: a desire to improve personal teaching skills in economics, a request from local administrators to be part of a local-system team, or the opportunity to earn graduate credit.[14] Being a participant in a workshop also resulted in becoming one link in a growing network of educators, with a resultant feeling of shared interest and concern. As an example, the 1950 Riverdale Workshop developed materials on inflation and government controls, and these materials were further refined by an economist recommended by the Joint Council and three curriculum specialists recommended by the National Council for the Social Studies. The result was a teaching

---

[12] Joint Council, Director's Letter to the Field, March 17, 1964.

[13] George E. Dawson, Preservice, In-Service, and Graduate Programs in Economic Education (New York: Joint Council, 1974), p. 13. Dawson pointed out that only two studies measured the actual impact on students, and that all other gains were measured by impressions.

[14] Ibid., p. 32.

pamphlet distributed to interested schools by the Office of Price Stabilization, and to the affiliated councils and workshop staff by the Joint Council. The pamphlet was used as a resource by the staff of the 1951 St. Louis workshop, where Willard Gambold of Indianapolis was a participant. When Gambold returned to Indianapolis he used his workshop experience to help his class develop a film script on "the issue of inflation in the election of 1896." A local television station agreed to carry the play, and the telecast was shown at the 1953 annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies.[15] From such slender beginnings as this, with increasing inter-connection and dissemination, more and more workshops were producing more materials and more teachers prepared to use them.

Locating financial contributors or supporters was a more serious problem than finding qualified participants for summer workshops. The Joint Council staff, and members of the Board of Trustees, worked diligently at finding support for both national and local workshops. Colleges and universities, and local or state school systems, had only limited funds available for such an enterprise, and economic education had to compete in the market place of public education with many other parts of the school curriculum. A strong affiliated

---

[15]The economist was Arthur Upgren, and the curriculum specialists were Edyth Gaines, John Clemm, and Julian Aldrich. Gambold spent part of 1953 in a tour of the United States under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, studying the quality of economics instruction in the country.

council could finance several workshops, as was the case with Illinois, and encourage contributions from local foundations or corporations. In addition to local and state public and private financial support, the federal government played a role in workshop and in-service financing. As a result of the "Sputnik crisis" of the late 1950s there was stepped-up federal support for curriculum improvement in the sciences. Although many economists considered their discipline to be not unlike a science in that they could develop models through mathematical equations, no one seriously considered teaching economics in the schools by using econometrics. However, many educators, economists and scientists did want students to learn that many government and industry actions that involved the application of science involved economic decision-making.

In a letter to the New York Times one month after the successful orbiting of the first Soviet satellite, as the first American satellites were undergoing their final preparations for launch, George Fersh of the Joint Council pointed out the link between scientific and economic education. He took the occasion to remind the paper's readers of a workshop to be held the next summer with the joint sponsorship of the Joint Council, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the National Science Teachers Association.[16] The workshop was held in August, 1958, at Sarah Lawrence College, New York,

---

[16]"Linking Science and Economics," letter by George Fersh to New York Times, 16 November 1957, sec. 1, A18. This letter refers to the editorial that appeared 11 November 1957.

under the direction of M. L. Frankel of the Joint Council. The consultants, most of whom had already worked with the Joint Council or the Committee for Economic Development, delivered talks on certain areas of scientific development and the economic implications of these developments. Thirty school systems were selected to send teams of science and social studies teachers and many of the participating school systems had already been involved with some aspect of the program of the Joint Council.[17]

Besides summer workshops and the academic year workshops or institutes, which involved in-service improvement in the ability of teachers to teach economics, and the preparation of materials that could be used by workshop participants, the Joint Council worked with separate school systems when requested. This practice was superseded by the Cooperating Schools Project of the 1950s and the Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) that began in 1964. DEEP became the central focus of the Joint Council's efforts to improve the teaching of economics in the school curriculum. But before DEEP had developed into the substantial program that it was in 1980, the Joint Council played a direct role with some local school systems. These experiences provided information and some "laboratory practice" for larger curriculum projects, including DEEP.

---

[17]Joint Council, The American Economy: An Appraisal of its Social Goals and the Impact of Science and Technology (New York: Joint Council, 1959); Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1958, and May, 1958. The teaching materials and a copy of the papers presented at the workshop were distributed to approximately 25,000 schools in 1961.

In 1951 the Baltimore, Maryland, City Schools adopted a project under the sponsorship of the Joint Council to improve their economic education at all levels and in all areas of their curriculum. At the first full meeting of the faculty and staff of the project, Baker himself conducted the orientation and introduced Dr. Dai Ho Chun, on leave from the University of Hawaii, as a special consultant who would be available for the entire year at the expense of the Joint Council. In the second year, Frankel replaced Chun as the consultant.[18] In 1953 Oak Park-River Forest High School in Illinois started a similar project, followed later in the year by the Waukegan, Cicero and Berwyn, and Evanston city systems. Chicago followed the same process in 1955, and in 1958 the Decatur schools entered a three-year project with the Joint Council, under the direction of Lewis Wagner of the University of Illinois.[19]

The desired goal was for the affiliated councils to establish and maintain direct contacts. In fact the most successful results did come in those instances where such contacts were developed. Besides the success in Illinois

---

[18]Maurice H. Schreiber, "Economics needs Emphasis," Social Education, 17 (November, 1953), pp. 333-35.

[19]Donald E. Jones, "Economic Education around the State: Decatur," The Councillor, 21 (March, 1960), p. 14. To support these projects, and similar kinds of work growing out of the annual summer workshops, the Illinois Council published a Standardized Economics Test, an Inventory of Economic Understanding, and a teachers' guide, Economics in the Classroom, all with support from a special grant from the Joint Council.

there were similar projects in Hartford, Connecticut, in Minneapolis, in New York City, all of them cities that enjoyed effective and abundant affiliated council support. But the Joint Council role in setting the precedent, and in encouraging continued support, was crucial.

One of the more notable large-scale ventures in in-service education was the nationwide television course in economics that was shown over CBS' "Continental Classroom" in 1962-63. The series "Continental Classroom" was first shown in 1958 as a response to the Soviet space successes, and the first years had presented courses in the sciences. But as the Science-Economics Workshop in 1958 had demonstrated, there was a relationship between decisions that were scientific in nature and the economic impact of those decisions. Thus, if there was justification for teaching the American public something about sciences, there was also justification for teaching it economics. Actually there seemed even more justification, as the Kennedy administration reminded an increasingly aroused public that we were involved in a "conflict" over economic theories and ideals. In this "conflict," the American democracy required an electorate informed about the economic issues: television had the capability of reaching almost all of that electorate, unlike the schools which touched only future voters. Thus television could play a special role in the economic education movement.

The Continental Classroom showing of "The American Economy" was not the first time that economic education had been taught through the medium of television. The Indianapolis

American history project already mentioned, "The Impact of Inflation on the Election of 1896," had been shown over a local television station. And in 1958 the Joint Council co-sponsored and co-produced a fourteen-week live series that concentrated on various areas of economic concern.[20] George Fersh, an associate director, spoke on the economic qualities of our natural resources, and M. L. Frankel, along with Carl Madden of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, took part in a panel discussion with several students on the topic of "What lies ahead?" The series was telecast in New York City over fourteen consecutive Friday mornings, and kinescopes were made that could be purchased from the Joint Council.

Despite what appeared to be successes with these local efforts, the magnitude of a year-long five-day-a-week show on economics was quite something else. The Learning Resources Institute of New Jersey first broached the idea to the Joint Council through its vice-president, E. DeAlton Partridge, president of Montclair State Teachers College, who had been actively involved in the Joint Council program for several years. The Joint Council in turn approached the Committee for Economic Development for assistance in getting financial support, the Ford Foundation for actual financial support, and the American Economic Association for help in putting the

---

[20]Joint Council, Newsletter, May, 1958, and February, 1959. The co-sponsors of this series were the New York City School System, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the New York Stock Exchange. M. L. Frankel, "The Joint Council on Economic Education: The First Ten Years," NASSP Bulletin, 42 (October, 1958), p. 127.

course together. In all three cases the results were successful. Herbert Malley, the director of the Committee's own fund-raising division, helped raise $1.5 million dollars from 101 foundations and corporations. Of this amount $833,000 was a direct grant from the Ford Foundation to the National Educational Television network and the Radio Center of Indiana University.[21] And the American Economic Association agreed to co-sponsor the television program under the general condition that a) the Executive Committee of the Association have a veto over the personnel conducting the program, and that b) detailed supervision by the Association be effected through its members on the National Task Force.[22]

John R. Coleman, head of the Department of Economics at Carnegie Institute of Technology, was selected to be the teacher of the program. He had the assistance of John H. Haefner, of the University of Iowa, who taught the methods classes in the series, and Kenneth O. Alexander, of Michigan College of Mining and Technology, who was responsible for content planning for both segments of the series.[23] One hundred and sixty

---

[21]Schriftgriesser, CED, p. 210, and an unsigned editorial, "School by TV adds another subject: The American Economy," Business Week, No. 1725 (September 22, 1962), p. 110. CBS donated its transmission facilities and 181 network affiliates contributed time for the showing. In addition, 66 educational television stations showed the series.

[22]American Economic Association, "Minutes," AER, 51 (May, 1961), p. 603.

[23]John R. Coleman, "Program for College of the Air's 'The American Economy,'" AER, 52 (September, 1962), pp. 940-45.

half-hour sessions were planned, which covered thirty-two weeks of instruction. Each week had four days of economic content taught by Coleman and one day of methods instruction taught by Haefner. The economics content of the course followed closely the suggested outline and topics of the recently-completed National Task Force Report.[24]

Support for the series was remarkably broad, which said much for the work of the staff, especially Coleman. Some businesses helped their employees get credit for the course at nearby colleges and universities, though others supposedly withheld open enthusiasm because "too much shouting by big business could give people the notion that this series is a platform for industry's ideas."[25] There had been disagreement with the Task Force Report, and with a Study Materials Evaluation that had been conducted by the Joint Council and released simultaneously with the Report; in both cases conservative business interests felt that the government's role in the economy had been emphasized or accepted too readily. But, when asked in an interview whether he had anticipated any adverse reaction to the programs Coleman had responded:

> I think there's bound to be some measure of protest from groups that operate either on the extreme left or extreme right in our economy . . . I think, however, that the vast majority of Americans will--if they watch the show

---

[24]Committee for Economic Development, Economic Education in the Schools: Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1961), pp. 54-62.

[25]"School by TV adds another subject: The American Economy," Business Week, No. 1725 (September 22, 1962), p. 110.

> more than once--see that we are trying to do an objective job; that we are not trying to sell any one set of values, or any one economic policy. We are trying to sell tools of analysis, to help a person develop an orderly way of thinking about our economic system. . . . My hope is that, by restricting myself to the role of presenting basic analysis, and then by inviting competent guests of opposing points of view to come in and discuss some of the more basic policy positions, we can achieve this objective of building closer understanding on the basis of which intelligent choices may be made.[26]

The Joint Council was quick to make special use of the television series. There was a direct mailing to approximately 85,000 key individuals before the series started that encouraged support and publicity. Joint Council staff and other economic education leaders traveled the circuit of conferences, institutes, and workshops to bear personal witness to the importance and potential of the program. Aid was extended to state councils which were organizing planning conferences and luncheons for key personnel.[27] At the conclusion of the series the Joint Council purchased fifty film sets of the course and distributed them to the affiliated councils for school use. The 128 content sessions were suggested as a basis for a course in economics principles, or as in-service materials for teacher education; the 32 methods lectures were recommended for pre- and in-service teacher education.[28] In accordance with Joint

---

[26]Henry Langer, "Scholastic Teacher interviews Dr. John R. Coleman about 'The American Economy,'" Senior Scholastic Teachers Edition, 81 (September 19, 1962), p. 11T

[27]Joint Council, Newsletter, May, 1962. Some of the conferences and luncheons were financed by the Learning Resources Institute.

[28]Joint Council, Minutes, January 31, 1961.

Council philosophy, it supported the efforts of the affiliated councils in providing their own support materials. In California the State Department of Education published a semester course in economics, developed by the Northern California Council on Economic Education and the Center for Economic Education at San Francisco State College, based on the television series. And in Minnesota the state council, re-invigorated by Roman Warmke, prepared a 305-page Study Guide under the direction of Harlan Smith which was published by the Joint Council in 1964.[29] The series was re-shown in the next year over the educational television network, and there was even some consideration of producing a follow-up course.

There never was a follow-up on the series at the national level, at least partly because the Joint Council was soon deeply involved in another major project of curriculum design. But there were some evaluations of this single effort, evaluations that demonstrate both the awesome potential and crucial weakness of the medium. The Nielson survey placed the average daily audience at between one and one-and-a-quarter million viewers. These figures demonstrate that a far larger number of people were presented with economics instruction in one year through television than had been able to attend workshops in the fifteen years of the Joint Council's existence. However, this number included only about 12,500 social studies teachers, or roughly only one of five social studies teachers,

---

[29] John R. Coleman, "Economic Literacy: What Role for TV?" AER, 53 (May, 1964), p. 645.

and only a fourth of these watched more than one program per week.[30] The social studies teachers who watched as many as three programs a week shared a number of characteristics: they had more academic preparation for teaching, had displayed a greater professional interest in teaching, were older, and taught in the larger urban schools.

The course was assumed to be the equivalent of one year's work in economics for non-specialists, which would go just a little beyond the minimum degree of economic literacy described in the 1961 National Task Force Report. It surveyed the same broad ground found in most widely-selling economic textbooks, and assumed supplementation by one of four adopted textbooks or on-campus work.[31] The Pittsburgh City Schools, with the active support of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, and the University of Pittsburgh, had seventy-one teachers take the course for credit. At the end of the year the teachers took the new Test of Economic

---

[30] Ibid., p. 647. The CED conducted a five-state survey that indicated that only 14 percent of the social studies teachers in those states were watching regularly.

[31] Credit for those participating in campus courses was offered by 388 colleges, and about 5,200 teachers took advantage of this. The adopted textbooks, and the instructor's guide, were: John R. Coleman and Kenneth O. Alexander, TV Study Guide for 'The American Economy' (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.); George L. Bach, Economics: An Introduction to Analysis and Policy, 3rd edition (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Co., 1960); C. Lowell Harriss, The American Economy: Principles, Practices, and Policies, 4th edition (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962); Campbell R. McConnell, Elementary Economics: Principles, Problems, and Policies (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960); Paul A. Samuelson, Economics: An Introductory Analysis, 5th edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961).

Understanding, as did 113 sophomores at Carnegie at the end of the second semester of the introductory course on economic principles, and a control group of 73 non-participating teachers. From a maximum score of 50, the participating teachers achieved a score of 40.9, the sophomores scored 40.8, and the control group scored 33.9.[32]

The results were favorable; an in-service education program in conjunction with college work (in Pittsburgh the teachers met every other Saturday for two hours with an economist) could achieve a foundation in economic literacy. Though this was only a minimum level when compared with the Task Force Report's recommendation of 18 hours of preparation in economics, the television course could serve as a base on which local systems and affiliated councils could build a larger program of economic education. Over the next few years the 60-session series that the Joint Council condensed from the entire program remained in great demand, with the new DEEP schools as well as any other interested systems. But there remained problems with this program as an efficient teaching device. To begin with it required a considerable investment of time, even though the abbreviated program distributed by the Joint Council comprised just over a third of the original television show. Any in-service program that entailed as much as sixty hours of

---

[32]Philip Saunders, "The Effectiveness of 'The American Economy' in Training Secondary School Teachers," AER, 54 (June, 1964), pp. 397-99.

participation was all too likely to meet with only minimal acceptance. And even at the completion of a program that required considerable involvement (watching the films and completing coordinated reading assignments or activities) the teacher had only acquired the equivalent of a single course in introductory economics, an inadequate amount for effective teaching purposes, though admittedly better than nothing. Unless the abbreviated film course was linked with a continuing program of in-service economic education its value was going to be limited.[33]

A major development in the program of the Joint Council occurred in 1954, when the Ford Foundation made a direct grant of $275,000 to be spent over a three-year period. This was in addition to the "regular" grant of $120,000 from the Foundation for Adult Education, which continued to be channeled through the Committee for Economic Development, acting as trustee.[34] With this special grant the Joint Council launched

---

[33]Donald D. Dowd, "A Coordinator's Perspective," DEEP 1969: Perspectives on a 5-Year Experiment in Curriculum Change (New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1969), pp. 50-60. Dowd cites the example of the Miami, Florida, schools, which had used the TV series for several hundred teachers in a system that employed over 10,000 teachers. Most teachers viewing the program believed that it asked too much for too little.

[34]Committee for Economic Development, Annual Report: 1955 (New York: CED, 1955), pp. 16-17; Joint Council, Minutes, September 24, 1954.

the Cooperating Schools Project for Curriculum Development, designed to achieve depth in the area of economics in the curriculum of local systems and actually test new methods of economic education. Fourteen school systems participated in this Project, which was more ambitious and comprehensive than the earlier projects that were carried out in schools scattered around the country.[35] Each system entered a formal agreement with the Joint Council, which offered the service support of its staff and functioned as the coordinating agency for the separate participating systems. Each system was also given $300 per year, to serve as an indicator of support: local systems were responsible for raising more funds, either from affiliated councils or from local organizations. In return for this support, each system appointed a coordinator who worked with a representative advisory group of teachers and local people in all fields of economic activity. Local or nearby colleges were also involved in a formal agreement and provided consultants for the schools, organized in-service programs on their campuses, designed better pre-service education programs for the future teachers they would graduate, and reviewed school materials and prepared their own for use in the schools.[36]

---

[35]The school systems were: Akron, Ohio; Indianapolis; Decatur, Illinois; Fort Dodge, Iowa; Kalamazoo; Milwaukee; Minneapolis; New York; Oklahoma City; Palo Alto, California; Portland, Oregon; Ridgewood, New Jersey; University City, Missouri; West Hartford, Connecticut.

[36]M. L. Frankel, "The Joint Council on Economic Education: The First Ten Years," NASSP Bulletin, 42 (October, 1958), pp. 125-27.

Some of the fourteen Cooperating Schools were in areas where there had been early activity by strong state or local councils, or by influential leaders convinced of the need for improved economic education. Some of these were: Martin Essex, Akron; Theral Herrick, Kalamazoo; Paul Coons, Hartford; and William Jansen, New York. The Joint Council had selected schools that already enjoyed a reputation for excellent curriculum development. Since the Joint Council could offer only limited support, the school systems themselves had to be committed to bringing about changes. The Joint Council did offer guidelines and suggestions, and attempted to coordinate efforts and disseminate information about the programs in the Cooperating Schools. Most of the schools first measured the economic knowledge of their teaching corps, using the test of economic understanding developed by the Illinois Council on Economic Education. Then they planned in-service training to fill in the areas where the tests had revealed the greatest weaknesses, using the Illinois Primer of Economic Education as a basic sourcebook as well as various materials from the Joint Council. At the same time, using the Inventory of Economic Understanding, also from the Illinois Council, committees of teachers determined what economics instruction was already provided in the schools' curricula.[37]

The Cooperating Schools Project enjoyed only limited success, but as a pilot program for future Joint Council

---

[37]Harold J. Bienvenue, A Report on the Completed Cooperating Schools Project (New York: Joint Council, 1960), pp. 13-15.

involvement with school systems it provided some useful lessons. Any chance of success depended on strong leadership from the school administration, and this was best achieved when someone was able to devote his full attention to the economic education aspect of the curriculum. The contact between the school system and the colleges and universities had to be contractual and not subject to arbitrary changes in personnel at either level. And specific teacher-developed classroom projects needed to be coordinated with economists to ensure that the economics instruction contained therein was valid and appropriate. Overall, the Joint Council felt that

> scientific evaluation of the total impact and ramifications of this kind of project is never easy; in fact, it may be impossible. These accomplishments, however, are clear: many teachers voluntarily attended long, hard, substantive sessions devoted to economics; a variety of classroom projects designed to improve economic education were successfully completed and widely reported; school relations with economically informed community leaders were strengthened. Less tangibly, there appears a new zest for economic education, . . . with a desire to read, rather than to avoid, items concerning local, national, and world economics.[38]

The "zest" for economic education that was appearing at the time of the Cooperating Schools Project continued to be demonstrated, and it was carefully nurtured by the Joint Council in the years that followed. The concept of a model school project was never lost sight of, and in 1963 there was another opportunity to bring it into being as a permanent program. In that year the Ford Foundation gave a $1.8 million dollar

---

[38]Ibid., p. 34.

grant to the Joint Council for its most ambitious project yet involving direct contact with local school systems. This grant provided the initial financing for the Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP), a five-year project which began operating in the schools in 1964 with ten school systems and by 1967 included a total of thirty. The objective was the same as that of all previous Joint Council-supported projects, to "develop prototype kindergarten through twelfth grade economic education programs which foster greater economic literacy."[39] Though not different in kind from many of the earlier individual local school projects, or from the earlier Cooperating Schools Project, it was considerably more comprehensive in degree.

There was a wider variety of school systems involved, displaying geographic and organizational diversity. These included two parochial systems, one state department of public instruction, three suburban schools, four county districts, three clusters of schools around a central city, and eighteen large city systems. The Joint Council devised DEEP with consultant help from an advisory committee of the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economics Association, and coordinated extensive cooperation between the DEEP schools and economists from colleges and universities. Seventy-five economists, from forty colleges, taught or helped the teachers

---

[39] John E. Maher, S. Stowell Symmes, and William D. Green, DEEP '67: A Progress Report on the Developmental Economic Education Program (New York: Joint Council, 1967), p. 5.

in the schools, and in three systems economists were put on the schools' payrolls as full-time consultants.[40]

All of these points demonstrate the multi-faceted role of the Joint Council in the DEEP project. It began in 1963 when the Joint Council sent word to affiliated council directors that it was considering a large-scale in-service curriculum project and it needed recommendations for participating schools. The school systems had to be genuinely enthusiastic about participating and had to have a good record of curriculum development, the affiliated council had to promise substantial support, and nearby colleges or universities had to agree to play an integral role in the project.[41] The Joint Council announced the new project to the general public at a press conference in June, 1964. There were three model schools in the first ten schools: these were Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, and Contra Costa, California. The Joint Council planned to work closely with the pilot schools for the first year, and then the affiliated councils would take over the close support for the final two years of the formal participation in the project. For the model schools, on the other hand, the Joint Council would work closely for the entire length of the project. The total project was to last for five years, with ten schools being admitted to participation in each of the first three years for a total of thirty schools.

---

[40]John E. Maher, "DEEP: Strengthening Economics in the Schools," AER, 59 (May, 1969), p. 231.

[41]Joint Council, Minutes, December 6, 1963.

For the model schools, the Joint Council promised a $35,000 grant for each year, or a total commitment of $105,000. In addition each affiliated council committed $10,000 for each year. Besides the direct financial grant the Joint Council provided various materials and services. Each school system received a month-long visit from both John Maher, the Senior Economist for the Joint Council and the Director of DEEP, and John Lawrence, the Director of Curriculum for the Joint Council: other staff members were made available as needed, and the affiliated councils were committed to provide staff help as needed. Each school was given kinescopes of all sixty sessions of "The American Economy" television series for use in the in-service program, copies of the National Task Force Report, and the Supplemental Materials Evaluation Committee Report, and a complete set of the study materials recommended by the Evaluation Committee.[42] Finally, the economic education coordinators for all of the systems were to be brought together periodically to meet with the staff of the Joint Council: the first meeting was held in January, 1965. The school systems, for their part, committed themselves to the appointment of a DEEP coordinator; designated policy, curriculum, and community advisory committees to support the project; promised to initiate teacher-training programs; and agreed to share experimental materials with other DEEP schools.[43]

---

[42]Joint Council, Newsletter, November, 1964; Joint Council, Minutes, January 31, 1964.

[43]Maher, DEEP '67, p. 6.

In a typical system the first year was spent in organizing the three committees mentioned above, and in establishing working guidelines for operating the project, preparing the classroom materials, evaluating the success or problems with the materials, and reporting to the Joint Council. After a summer workshop for instruction of the faculty that would be involved, materials were developed to be used in the classroom. In the second summer, more workshops were held to give further instruction or to include a wider segment of the faculty, and to improve the teaching materials. In the third year the revised materials were used for the second time in the classroom, and that summer they were "polished off" in final workshops before being sent to the Joint Council.[44] After the third year the schools were "on their own" though they continued to be part of the DEEP system.

In 1966 the Joint Council launched Phase 2 of DEEP (DEEP II), following the apparent initial successes of the project in the first thirty school systems. In DEEP II local councils were to establish working relationships with school systems in their areas. When the schools appointed a project coordinator and promised that sufficient resources would be made available for supporting the project, they were designated Cooperating Schools and received materials from the Joint Council and from the DEEP I schools. Some of the schools that applied for participation in DEEP II were recruited by the

---

[44]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

affiliated councils and centers, some had worked with nearby DEEP I schools, and others were contacted by community leaders who were familiar with the economic education program of the Joint Council.[45]

In 1971 the Charles S. Mott Foundation made a five-year grant to the Joint Council for the purpose of adding one hundred new school systems annually to DEEP II. At the same time the Kazanjian Foundation made a special grant so that DEEP II could be extended into the New England area.[46] The financial support thus proffered was particularly important because the Joint Council was going through a period of belt-tightening. The inflation in the economy and the competition from other sectors of the school curriculum were causing many contributors to either hold their financial support to the same level for several years or to shift it to other problem areas. The resulting shortfall in funds was not being offset by new contributors. In the fall of 1971 there was some consideration given to a "Big New Move," which would be comparable in impact to DEEP I and would attract a substantial amount of attention and support. George Fersh, the Associate Director responsible for the affiliated councils, urged that the Joint Council continue to place its emphasis on DEEP II, and the trustees and staff put renewed effort into the project. Thus the Mott

---

[45]Joint Council, Minutes, October 18, 1966; also, Maher, DEEP '67, pp. 37-38.

[46]Joint Council, Minutes, January 7, 1972.

and Kazanjian Foundations' support was a very welcome indicator of continuing support.[47]

Writing at the end of DEEP I, the first project director, John Maher, suggested four areas that would have to be examined to determine the impact and success of the project. First, how many teachers were instructed in economics, and with what effect? Using the Test of Economic Understanding, he suggested that the workshops and in-service education programs had achieved results at least equivalent to those that followed from taking a college-level principles course, and from participating in "The American Economy" television course, at a cost of only $200 per teacher.[48] Second, what was the quality of the curricular materials produced? Maher noted that the Contra Costa, California, materials were of a sufficient quality to be produced commercially, and selected other items were widely distributed through the DEEP system and offered for sale through the Joint Council. Third, what had been the effects on student economic understanding? In the thirty systems that participated in DEEP I, over four-and-a-half million students were involved. Maher cited reports filed by the schools that indicated substantial improvement in student scores on the TEU,

---

[47]Joint Council, Minutes, September 17, 1971. For indications of the problems of fund-raising, see Minutes, September 13, 1968, and January 16, 1970.

[48]Maher, AER (1969), p. 232. Maher calculated that the project had cost about 2 million dollars in the first year, and had divided the total number of teachers involved into that figure. If the teacher instruction was a "bargain" at $200, everything else was a free bonus.

at least from the sophomore through the senior years of high school. (With those schools that put their efforts into elementary instruction, no final evaluation had been achieved.) Finally, how successful had the project been in getting help from academic economists? All of the model schools had hired economists to be full-time consultants, and most of the pilot schools had at least a part-time consultant. Also, seventy-five economists from forty colleges had taught or helped teachers in the thirty school systems.[49]

The Joint Council had originally intended to conduct its own evaluation of the project and employed Hilda Grubman especially for that purpose. Grubman organized two five-day sessions to which DEEP schools and supporting colleges and universities sent representatives. The sessions presented a general background on research and evaluation and demonstrated some specific practices in the construction of evaluation instruments. Each system was encouraged to conduct its own evaluation.[50] The Joint Council was unable to continue with its own project-wide evaluation, however, and turned instead

---

[49]Ibid., p. 231. Pittsburgh had two consultants, Carol Adams and Philip Saunders; Minneapolis had John Helmberger; Contra Costa had Suzanne Wiggins. Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1965.

[50]Yungko Kim and Daniel W. Kratochvil, Product Development Report No. 16: Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) (Palo Alto, Cal.: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1972), p. 31. One of the sessions was held at the University of Illinois where Grubman worked with J. Thomas Hastings, the Director of the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE). Hastings and CIRCE worked with the Psychological Corporation when DEEP was evaluated by the latter.

to The Psychological Corporation. George P. Hollenbeck conducted the evaluation for The Psychological Corporation, and there were two reports; one was compiled after the first-year schools had completed their three-year involvement and the second after DEEP I was completed.[51] In 1972 the United States Office of Education commissioned reports on twenty-one projects in an attempt to document what had occurred in the development of a "recent educational product that appeared to have potential impact." DEEP was one of the "products" so identified, and the researchers relied heavily on the second Hollenbeck evaluation.[52]

DEEP I was judged a qualified success in all of the reports cited above. It was felt that the participating schools benefited from financial and consulting resources, contact with other schools, and the increased leverage within the community that resulted from being part of a national program; that economic education experiences were provided to teachers not likely to have gotten them without this program; and that new materials were developed, three-quarters of which would not have been possible without participation in DEEP.

---

[51]George P. Hollenbeck, A Report of the First-Year Evaluation of the Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP), Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1968); also, Hollenbeck, A Report of the Evaluation of the Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP), Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1970).

[52]Kim and Kratochvil, DEEP, pp. 26-29. All of these reports evaluated DEEP I.

For the Joint Council, the successful results were that affiliated councils were able to build stronger links to the business community, and that, since total DEEP expenditures were greater than the initial grant made by the Joint Council, the Council helped obtain more funds for economic education than might otherwise have been made available.

There were problems with the project. It appeared that the three-year time limit was unrealistic, that any long-term results would require a longer period of concentrated support. Greater financial support was necessary to maintain the larger program development. Of a more serious nature, the success of the program depended on the commitment and ability of a full-time coordinator who was a capable administrator. Where any of these were lacking, DEEP had a difficult time competing with other projects for administrative attention. The biggest problem was seen to lie with the preparation and use of materials of instruction. Many of the materials that were produced were criticized for being too "Horatio Alger" success-oriented, and for overplaying the ideas of "unlimited wants" and the "economic motive as THE basis for people seeking employment."[53] Worse yet, many materials were not being disseminated throughout the school system that produced them, and in fact fewer were being used two years after the project was completed that when the project had ended.[54]

---

[53]Maher, DEEP '67, pp. 31-34.

[54]Hollenbeck, Evaluation, p. 64.

These findings were supported in 1975 by the only study that had been made as of 1980, which attempted to measure the lasting effects of the project.[55] The study was conducted in the Minneapolis schools, which had been one of the model school systems in DEEP I and had therefore received much more extensive support than the 27 pilot schools in DEEP I and the Cooperating Schools in DEEP II. The study evaluated the changes in economic education in Minneapolis between 1967 and 1971, and was conducted in the three high schools that had been part of DEEP I. Before 1964, only one teacher in the combined faculties had been an economics major, and the vast majority had had no formal economic training at all. Between 1964 and 1967, teachers at the schools received totals of 39, 27, and 24 quarter credits through the in-service program administered by the University of Minnesota. After 1967, the schools offered no formal in-service program, but the National Science Foundation and the Minnesota State Council on Economic Education offered grants for summer workshop participation: only a few teachers from the schools applied for the grants or attended the workshops.

This decline in teacher involvement was matched by a decline in student economic understanding: the Minneapolis project report had noted a rise in student scores on the Test of Economic Understanding during the life of the project, but the study revealed a significant drop in student scores

---

[55] William E. Becker, Jr., John D. Helmberger, and Jerry L. Thompson, "An Evaluation of a Developmental Economic Education Project Given Limited Data," Journal of Economic Education, 6 (Spring, 1975), pp. 120-25.

after 1967. The school that recorded the smallest drop in student scores also had the smallest turnover of teachers: more DEEP I-trained teachers were still on the faculty teaching economics more effectively than was true of the other two schools. The authors summarized the results of their study:

> The above findings suggest that a 'pump-priming' type of program may not be sufficient to maintain high levels of student learning. After the initial training of teachers and developmentary work is terminated, it may still be necessary to continue with programs specific to the school districts being serviced. . . . The termination of DEEP appears to have had a significant negative effect on student learning of economics.[56]

The study of Minneapolis indicated the immensity of the problem facing the leaders of the economic education movement. The administration of the Minneapolis schools had been consistently supportive of efforts to improve economic education in the curriculum. The Minnesota State Council has generally been considered one of the most active, and one of the best, of the network of affiliated councils. Yet the study provided some discouraging results. At the same time, the gains made by schools that were active participants in the Cooperating Schools program, gains that included increased economic literacy among students, indicated that improved teacher preparation is central to the goal of improved understanding of economics. The Joint Council acted on this premise from the earliest years of its existence, and provided leadership and support to the

---

Ibid., p. 125.

economic education movement with its in-service program. As an important focus of DEEP was in-service education, it was a logical step forward in this program.

CHAPTER 4

THE PRE-SERVICE PROGRAM

The Joint Council grew from an in-service education project, and much of the initial thrust of its program was aimed towards the expansion of a network of affiliated councils that would be able to support in-service education projects. The advantage that could be gained from teaching economics to experienced teachers, and from helping them to produce materials for economic education, seemed both obvious and attainable. Hence the rapid expansion of workshops with the encouragement and support of the Joint Council. There was another obvious method of improving the quality of the teaching of economics in the public schools, and that was to prepare the teachers before they entered the profession. The Joint Council began more slowly in this direction but within a decade was pursuing a pre-service program that was as ambitious as the in-service program.

Greater difficulty was involved in working to improve initial teacher preparation. First, as already mentioned, there was the inherent difficulty of determining the best level of college and university economics to be taught to the non-specialist. Even when agreement was reached among college and university faculty that they shared in the responsibility to train public school teachers better prepared to teach

economics, there was considerable disagreement as to what were the best methods for meeting this responsibility. In addition, economic educators had to proceed carefully in suggesting to academic economists that they needed to improve upon their own teaching. When faculty members came to this conclusion on their own, the Joint Council could offer assistance, even if it was only a channel for exchanging ideas and information, but it was a more difficult matter to suggest to the unconvinced that they would benefit from a reappraisal of their methods of teaching economics. Not only were economists being asked to re-examine the quality of teaching in their own field, but pre-service preparation in economics of future teachers required coordination with faculty in the schools of education. Where there was any conflict between departments, or any difficulty in achieving this coordination, improving teacher preparation became more difficult. Finally, certification of teachers involved state legislatures and boards of education, and certification requirements and procedures varied from state to state. In this case the affiliated council network of the Joint Council offered the opportunity to work individually in each state, which made it easier to address the problem of teacher certification.

Once the problem of improving college instruction in economics for future teachers was considered, there was no reason to limit this reappraisal to teacher preparation only. Instead there was every reason to anticipate that the broader area of the teaching of economics at the college level would be re-examined. This situation did develop, and the Joint

Council played an important role in the attempts to improve the college courses, but the first involvement with a college and university program began with the problem of pre-service preparation for teachers. In April, 1952, Baker suggested to the Executive Committee that a Commission on Economics in Teacher Education be created, to be co-sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the American Economic Association, the National Association of Business Teacher Training Institutes, the National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies.[1] The Executive Committee supported the organization of the Commission but debated for some time the appropriateness of adding a pre-service education project to the Joint Council program. It was finally agreed upon, but the Commission was to be a separate organization and not directly part of the Joint Council network or program.

---

[1]As with the Joint Council the impetus for creating the CETE came from a workshop held at New York University, this one in the summer of 1951. The representatives at the meeting in February, 1952, where the creation of the CETE was proposed came from the AACTE (Lloyd Young and E. DeAlton Partridge), the AEA (James Bell, the Executive Secretary, and Harold Clark, a member of the Subcommittee on the Teaching of Economics in the Schools), the CED (Sylvia Stone and Robert Donaldson), and the Joint Council (Baker and Nourse). They decided to invite the NCSS, the ASCD, and National Committee of the NEA to join. Joint Council, Minutes of the Executive Committee, April 22, 1952; Joint Council, Newsletter, March, 1952; Taylor, "Report," AER, XLIII (May, 1953), p. 572.

The Commission was formed on August 30, 1952, and selected officers (E. DeAlton Partridge, of Montclair Teachers College as President, Horace Taylor of Columbia University as Vice-President), and an Executive Committee (besides the officers this included Samuel P. McCutcheon of New York University, Laurence Leamer, Lloyd Young, and Baker). Arch W. Troelstrup, on leave from Stephens College in Missouri, was appointed Executive Director, and he set about organizing support for the Commission.[2] The major objectives of the Commission were to a) effect a working relationship among groups working for economic education and the preparation of teachers, b) find problem areas in the field of economic education and promote needed research, c) sponsor and direct workshops every summer during the life of the project, d) select "cooperating colleges" to work with the Commission and to develop experimental programs, and e) provide field consultation service to cooperating colleges.[3]

---

[2]Joint Council, Newsletter, March 1952 and October 1952; E. DeAlton Partridge, "Report of the Commission on Economics in Teacher Education," in Sixth Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington: AACTE, 1953): 100-102.

[3]Joint Council, Annual Report 1954; James Gemmell, Annual Report, 1953-54; Commission on Economics in Teacher Education, New York, 1954 (mimeographed). The twelve colleges and universities that initially agreed to cooperate in the objectives of the Commission were Miami University, New York University, Ohio University, George Peabody College, Queens College, the State University of Iowa, Syracuse University, Northwestern University, the University of Mississippi, and the New Jersey State Teachers Colleges at Montclair, Newark, and Trenton. Gemmell replaced Troelstrup as Executive Director in 1954.

A workshop was held by the Commission in the summer of 1953, and another was planned for the following summer. The group of educators and economists who had shown interest began to circulate information about the Commission and its objectives to other interested persons and to their respective professional organizations. This was especially true of the AEA, where Ben Lewis, of Oberlin College, began to assume the leadership of the economic education movement among the academic economists. In December, 1953, Lewis reported to the Executive Committee of the AEA on the workshop held that summer at Riverdale School, where he had been one of the consultants. He requested that the AEA prepare a register of college and university economics professors who were interested in teacher education. He further requested that a Round Table on Economic Education be held at the next annual meeting of the AEA. And he suggested that at that time the AEA establish a Standing Committee on Economic Education.[4]

While the AEA was being encouraged to become more attentive to the problem of improving economics instruction in the colleges and universities, and to the preparation of secondary school teachers in the discipline of economics, the Commission on Economics in Teacher Education was having

---

[4]Ben Lewis, "Report to the Executive Committee," AER, XLIV (May, 1954), p. 700. An Ad Hoc Committee on Economic Education was established in 1954, with Lewis as chairman; the Round Table was held and subsequent ones have been held at every annual meeting of the AEA; and the Ford Foundation financed the preparation of a register of economists involved with teacher education, which was distributed to every member of the AEA and to the Joint Council.

identification problems. The projected workshop for 1954 had to be canceled due to lack of financial support,[5] and the Joint Council included the topic of teacher preparation in a tripartite workshop it held that summer at the Riverdale School. Besides the work of forty economists who examined the role of economics in general education, the groundwork was being laid for a newly-initiated project on conservation and the use of natural resources, and thirty educators and economists were meeting with the Joint Council to evaluate and plan the Joint Council program.[6]

The Commission itself had been evaluated by Dean Waldo E. Lessenger, of Wayne University, who commended the program for "good work being done" but raised questions about an unnecessary duplication of efforts and the lack of resources to carry out an effective program once one had been decided upon. The report of the Joint Council evaluation study, consideration of which was also a part of the Riverdale Workshop in 1954, pointed out that the Joint Council had effectively alerted economists and organizations interested in economics to the need for action in the public schools and had become nationally known as the leading agency in this field (in the words of the report, "the

---

[5] In December, 1952, the Joint Council had voted a grant of $8,500 to the Commission, but specified that this would be the last grant of this nature it could make.

[6] Joint Council, Newsletter, October 1954. Also, in May, 1954, the Joint Council hosted a one-day Conference on Economics in General Education in Washington, D.C., to which were invited representatives from the federal government, the CED, the NEA, the ASCD, and the Brookings Institute. The Proceedings of the Riverdale Conference were published by the Joint Council.

clearer of the land and the plower of the soil to which others came to do their individual planting as an addition to what the Joint Council has sown").[7] But it stated that the Joint Council was still weak in bridging the gap in understanding between economists and educators, though the 1954 Riverdale Workshop was a "start on the long road of mutual understanding." It further warned the Joint Council against diffusing its resources by promoting programs for which they would be unable to provide adequate follow-up.

The possibilities for action provided by the existence of the Commission and the newly-aroused attention of respected leaders in the AEA, combined with the recommendation to the Joint Council to increase efforts at "bridging the gap" while not diffusing further program efforts, created a challenging situation for the young organization. The solution it arrived at marked an important turning point for the Joint Council. In December, 1954, the Executive Committee agreed to include the program of the Commission on Economics in Teacher Education in an expanded Joint Council program, which would include far greater involvement with college and university economists and educators.[8] Partly because of the new college and university program, the Joint Council began de-emphasizing its direct

---

[7]Sherman Gould, An Evaluation Study of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1954), p. 72.

[8]Joint Council, Minutes, December 13, 1954. Dr. Edward J. Allen, Associate Director of the Joint Council, was made responsible for this important phase of the overall program.

involvement with local school and in-service projects; as the affiliated councils were becoming more numerous and more effective the Joint Council could concentrate on working with the field directors and help them extend assistance to the schools. Two major national projects were started in 1955, but the philosophy of local direction of the program was more and more emphasized after 1954.

The first project for the new college and university program was a Conference on Economics in General Education for Future Teachers held at Saranac Lake, New York, in the summer of 1955, which Syracuse University co-sponsored. Fifteen instructors in economics or education were invited to draft projects for the improvement of their own teaching of economics; it was understood that such projects would involve experimentation with content as well as with methods of instruction.[9] The staff of the Joint Council and such economists or educators as Roy Price and Archibald McIsaac of Syracuse University, Ben Lewis, Arno Bellach of Columbia, and Paul Strayer of Princeton, were the consultants for the conference. The participants at the conference agreed to keep a detailed record of their projects, to call upon consultants as needed during the year of experimentation, to attend conferences of the Saranac group during the school year, to evaluate the effectiveness of their efforts and to write summary reports of

---

[9]Joint Council, The Classroom and the Joint Council, February, 1958; Newsletter, November, 1955.

their projects. In each case, the administration of the institutions involved approved full participation of its representatives and its colleges in the program. The next major step was made when the Joint Council established the practice of having each participating college select a team of a professor of economics and a professor of education. This practice not only made a greater impact on the campus but created the opportunity to bring together in a formal arrangement the body of knowledge which educators had developed over several decades with the body of knowledge which economists had developed for a common goal.[10] These teams then participated in the second national conference, which was held at Sagamore, New York, in the summer of 1956.

The Conference on Economics in General Education of 1954 had used a set of working papers prepared in advance by Lewis Wagner of the State University of Iowa and William Verkage of Boston University to focus their discussions in the first general session. At the outset of that conference the educators had stressed methodology and had anticipated working toward "content-with-answers," whereas the economists had stressed the tools of analysis and were wary of offering solutions. By the end of the conference most of the participants had developed individual projects that were a mixture of both.[11]

---

[10]The practice of sending teams from the colleges and universities was similar in purpose and effect to the practice of sending teams from local school systems to the state and regional workshops.

[11]Commission on Economics in Teacher Education, Economics in General Education: Proceedings of the Riverdale Conference

Two years later the participants met to share projects which they themselves had prepared in advance, and were able to build on the experience of the Saranac Lake participants of the year before. Consultants at the conference for the most part were Saranac Lake participants who had successfully conducted their own projects in one or more of their classes during the preceding year.[12] During the next school year most of the institutions participating at Sagamore were visited by a Joint Council staff member. Many of the projects proved successful, and in a few cases represented a continuation of the programs initiated by the Saranac Lake Conference participants.

As previously indicated, the American Economic Association was at this time being encouraged to play more of a leadership role in improving economic instruction in the secondary schools. In 1946 the Subcommittee on the Teaching of Economics in the Secondary Schools had recommended that the AEA become affiliated with the National Council for the Social Studies in a cooperative effort to improve the quality of economics instruction, but the AEA had rejected the recommendation. Many individual economists continued to participate

---

(1954), ed. James Gemmell (New York: Joint Council, 1954), pp. 11-13.

[12]The Institutions represented by teams were: Purdue University; Teachers College, Columbia University; the State University of Iowa; Brigham Young University; the University of Southern California; Indiana University; the University of Colorado; Pennsylvania State University; the University of Washington; the Ohio State University; the University of Connecticut; Syracuse University; the University of Illinois; the University of Minnesota; Oklahoma State University; and the University of Texas.

in projects with school systems and with the Joint Council, but there was no sense of collective association or responsibility. The change in attitude that was marked in 1957 by the affiliation of the AEA with the Joint Council was largely the result of the efforts of Ben Lewis of Oberlin College. He had first worked with the Joint Council in 1952 in planning the Conference on Economics in Teacher Education that was held in the summer of 1953. At the 1953 annual meeting of the AEA Lewis reported on the summer conference at a Round Table session, and suggested to the Executive Committee that the association organize a standing committee on economic education.[13]

The effort to organize the standing committee took two years, but its creation was agreed to in 1955. Ben Lewis was appointed the first chairman, and the other initial members were Archibald McIsaac, Paul Strayer, Clark Bloom, and Floyd Bond. In addition, Clark Bloom was elected to the Executive Committee of the Joint Council and was joined on the Board of Trustees by Lewis and Lester Chandler.[14] These three representatives were sent at the invitation of the Joint Council. And in 1957, after repeated recommendation from Lewis

---

[13]Lewis, "Report," AER 44 (May, 1954): 700-701. The Special Committee on Undergraduate Teaching of Economics had completed its work by 1949, but the Subcommittee on the Teaching of Economics in the Schools had been re-constituted as the Ad Hoc Committee on Economics in Teacher Education of the AEA, and continued work on the complex problem of teacher preparation. Ben Lewis was the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[14]Lewis, "Report," AER 46 (May, 1956): 619-22.

and the committee, the AEA agreed to become affiliated with the Joint Council. Thus the Joint Council became the only major economic education organization in the country enjoying an official relationship with the nation's pre-eminent professional organization in economics and the path was prepared for a continuing exchange of views and ideas. A meeting in May, 1957 was an example of how this relationship could operate. The meeting was held at the Joint Council offices in New York City, and present were the Committee members from the AEA, the staff of the Joint Council, and twenty selected economists. The participants discussed the Sagamore projects, considered ways to improve teacher training workshops, and were informed about the establishment of the first centers of economic education on college campuses.[15]

At the AEA meeting in 1955 when the Committee on Economic Education was formally established, Lewis lay down the challenge facing the economics profession:

> One significant fact has emerged clearly from our several experiences: economics is 'on the march' in the schools, in business, and in adult and general education. . . . There is great strength in the movement, and, at least so far as sheer volume is concerned, it will make substantial strides in the years immediately ahead, either with or without the support of our profession. On the score of direction or quality, however, there is reason for uncertainty and even misgiving. Herein, it seems to us, as well as to many who have indicated their concern to us, lies an opportunity for and the responsibility of professional economists.

---

[15]Lewis described these initial steps of cooperation at the 10th Anniversary Proceedings, where he pointed out that it "began to dawn on a growing number of the profession that economists were missing a great opportunity and shirking a clear responsibility."

> If the level of economic understanding among the American people that results from this movement is lower than we believe to be good, and if in the meantime we sit by, indifferent or uncertain or inactive, we have only ourselves to blame.[16]

And in 1956, discussing a presentation by Lewis and Bloom at a Round Table session on economic education at the annual meeting of the AEA, Meno Lovenstein, of Ohio State University, added to this challenge:

> Professors Lewis and Bloom, in urging that economists be heard and understood and do something, are in fact redefining economics and the work of economists. They are not, by fullest realization, describing an adjunct to one's professional duties or arousing the stuporous conscience of a citizen. What is now required is professional awareness of the total social and intellectual complex in which the economist and his science function.[17]

To the active supporters of the economic education movement, assembled at the 10th Anniversary dinner of the Joint Council, Lewis explained why caution was still called for on their part. Despite the legitimate successes the Joint Council had achieved in its decade of existence, the challenges mentioned above had still not been successfully met, and there remained possible pitfalls. To begin with he cautioned against overconfidence that might result from the successes gained: as he commented, "don't confuse raised heads with rolled-up sleeves." Related to overconfidence was the possibility of overeagerness. Economic education was still "not the way economists earned their income, or where they got their

---

[16] Lewis, "Report," AER 45 (May, 1955): 685. Lewis was reporting to the Executive Committee on the work of creating the Standing Committee on Economic Education.

[17] Lewis, "Report," AER 47 (May, 1957): 684.

training." He urged that the Joint Council maintain its program but not push too hard and become unprofessional: the growing respect of the economist was being earned with laborious care, and was too important to be carelessly squandered. To this end, it was preferable that the Joint Council concentrate on improving the training of teachers and let the economists improve the economic courses in the colleges and universities.[18]

These words of caution and concern from the acknowledged leader of the economic education movement among economists were appropriate and timely, and they reflected the impact that the Joint Council was beginning to make on college faculty through its College and University Program.

To counsel this part of the Program in economic education a ten-person National Advisory Committee was established that first met in November, 1957. The meeting resulted in the identification of ten major policy and procedural areas of concern to the Joint Council, and reflected the broad range of the economic community with which the Joint Council attempted to share these concerns.[19]

The Joint Council was acting on its philosophy in another important manner during this period. In 1956 two

---

[18]Joint Council on Economic Education, Education for the Economic Challenges of Tomorrow: Report of a Symposium in Conjunction with the Tenth Anniversary Observance of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: Joint Council, 1959), pp. 49-50.

[19]Joint Council, The Classroom and the Joint Council, February, 1958. To my knowledge this committee never met again after these areas were identified.

regional meetings were held at which economists and educators from those regions explored the condition of teacher preparation in economics. At East Tennessee State College, Edward Allen, the Director of the College and University Program, and Laurence Senesh of the Joint Council, with Meno Lovenstein, S. P. McCutcheon and Archibald McIsaac, worked with Lloyd Pierce, the Director of the School of Business Administration and Economics at the College, and Lolla Walker, the Curriculum Director of the Nashville City Schools and a leader in the Tennessee Council on Economic Education. Present at the meeting were representatives from ten colleges and universities from Tennessee, Virginia, and the Carolinas.[20] And in June the Joint Council co-sponsored with the New England Council on Economic Education, the Connecticut Council for the Advancement of Economic Education, and Boston University, the Osgood Hill Conference on Economics in General Education. Present at this meeting were representatives from seven schools in Connecticut, eight in Massachusetts, and the universities of Maine and Vermont. Modeled after the Tennessee meeting, the college and university representatives met in general session to hear lectures on economic policies and problems and on education methodology, then met in intensive work sessions to prepare projects they could use to improve teacher preparation in their schools.[21]

---

[20] Joint Council, Newsletter, May, 1956. The 1957 meeting at East Tennessee State College involved only Tennessee schools.

[21] Joint Council, Newsletter, October, 1956. The Osgood Hill Conference became an annual event until 1964, after which time each state held its own conference.

In 1957 there were five other regional conferences at which two or more representatives--presidents, deans, directors, heads of departments, and faculty members--from groups of colleges and universities met to discuss the improvement of college economics courses, and with that an improvement in the preparation of public school teachers. In January there was a one-day meeting at the University of Texas, in February twenty-six institutions met at Oklahoma State University, in April forty-five faculty members from seventeen institutions met at the State University of Iowa, in May there was a meeting at the University of Mississippi and in October at Ohio University. At all of these conferences representatives from the staff of the Joint Council provided the linkage with the expanding national movement to improve pre-service preparation of teachers and economics teaching in the colleges and universities.[22]

The College and University Program of the Joint Council was greatly boosted when several institutions began to support the economic education movement either directly or indirectly. In addition to the conferences of economists and educators mentioned before, some colleges and universities created a position on their faculty for a professor of economic education. The first one in the country was created at Purdue University in 1957, and the first professor of economic education was Laurence Senesh. Senesh had come to

---

[22]Joint Council, The Classroom and the Joint Council, February, 1958.

the Joint Council in 1952 as an associate director and staff economist and had played a major role in curriculum development (he worked closely with the Cooperating Schools Project), was a workshop consultant almost year-round, and had created the first filmstrip the Joint Council produced for school use.[23] Also in 1957, two associate professors of economic education were appointed; at the University of Illinois Lewis Wagner accepted the position, and at Ohio University Harry Crewson. Wagner had already been a leader in Iowa and continued his key role with the Illinois Council on Economic Education.

A second major advancement was the creation of centers of economic education on college campuses. The first one designated as such was organized at the State University of Iowa where Clark Bloom became the first director. Because of the large investment and commitment, these centers required support of college administrators as well as members of the departments of economics and education. The Iowa center was established in 1956, and by 1963 there were still only 15. In 1965 the Joint Council sponsored a three-day conference for leaders of college and university centers that was held at

---

[23]Joint Council, Newsletter, November 1957; Annual Report 1957, p. 1. Lewis might have been the "godfather" of the economic education movement because of his crucial and enthusiastic role in generating support among fellow economists and in the professional organization. But Lawrence Senesh was the leading economist to participate directly in the Joint Council programs from the beginning, and he helped establish the high standards which earned the Joint Council respect and cooperation. Frankel, the central figure for over twenty years, made his mark as an educator and not as an economist.

the Georgia State College Center for Economic Education in Atlanta. The director at Georgia State was Theodore Boyden, who two years before had held the position of College and University Program Director with the Joint Council. The conference was the first one held for those economic educators located on the college campuses, and 25 center directors and interested persons attended. The Joint Council was represented by Frankel, George Fersh, and the four regional representatives.[24] One of the results of this conference was a loose-leaf Handbook that was prepared by the Joint Council and distributed to the affiliated councils. As a framework for the discussions at the Atlanta conference, preliminary drafts of the proposed Handbook had been prepared by Sidney Kronish, of Montclair State College, Norman Townshend-Zellner, of California State College at Fullerton, Lewis Wagner, back at the University of Iowa, and Roman Warmke, of the University of Minnesota. After the Atlanta conference in 1965, there was steady growth in the number of institutions participating. The growth was rapid enough to warrant a summer workshop for center directors, which was held at Ashland College in Ohio in 1969. Although the most rapid growth in this aspect of the Joint Council's program took place in the latter half of the 1960s, the first efforts in the mid-1950s set a pattern. These centers became the institutional link between the scholarly expertise and capability of the colleges and

---

[24]Joint Council, Minutes, June 25, 1965; Newsletter, November, 1965.

universities and the local school systems. They helped train teachers through in-service projects such as workshops, worked with college faculty to improve their courses in economics and with education departments to expand the teaching of economics in teacher-preparation courses, and performed research and publication functions.

The Tenth Anniversary celebration in 1958 was an occasion for backpatting and words of encouragement, but the Joint Council faced a problem shared by most other organizations working in the field of education. It was necessary to keep up steady activity merely to maintain any gains that had been achieved; to achieve new gains new efforts must continually be made. This was true of the fund raising problems already noted; it was true of the problem of gaining recognition and support of both economists and educators at both the college and local school level, and it was true of the overall problem of teaching economic understanding to the students in the schools. New contributors had to be found, old ones had to be encouraged to continue their support. School and university faculty members had to be constantly reminded of the need for improved economic literacy and of their responsibility for helping to achieve it. And school personnel had to be informed, helped, trained, given materials, and in general kept reminded of the needs of the students. Much that had worked successfully in economic education had to be continually repeated, and new ideas had to be continuously sought after and tried. This was to be as true of the next ten years of the Joint

Council, as it developed its program through the 1960s, as it had been for the first ten years of its existence.

In 1959 Edward Allen left his position as associate director for the College and University Program of the Joint Council to return to teaching and a position with the Northern New York Economic Education Council. He was replaced in 1960 by Theodore Boyden, an economist with a Wall Street consulting firm.[25] He joined a staff that already had associate directors for curriculum and materials development, and for general organization and special projects. In addition, since 1958 the Joint Council had been employing college economists on an annual basis to provide the special skills of economists as consultants for the specific projects. The first Staff Economist was Jim Reese of the University of Oklahoma, who was replaced in 1959 by Siona Kagan of Washington University in St. Louis and in 1960 by Percy Guyton of Memphis State University.[26] Frankel and the trustees recognized that financial support might be more willingly tendered to a project in economic education that issued from an organization where an economist was on the job checking for accuracy and appropriateness. Although all the staff had training in economics, it still seemed preferable to hire a full-time economist for this advisory position.

---

[25]Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1960; Minutes, February 11, 1960.

[26]Guyton stayed with the Joint Council for four years.

In 1962 a report from a Ford Foundation evaluation of the work of the Joint Council recommended that an advisory committee be established by the AEA to work directly with the Joint Council. This committee, "responsible" to the AEA, could ensure the economic probity of the Joint Council program, and this assurance could serve as further encouragement to potential contributors that their money would be well-spent.[27] The Special Advisory Committee to the Joint Council was created in 1963 when the AEA re-constituted its Committee on Economic Education as a permanent part of the association. Ben Lewis, the chairman of the old committee since its inception in 1956, remained on the new committee but the new chairman was George L. Bach of Carnegie Institute of Technology. Joining Lewis and Bach on the new committee were Robert Gordon of the University of California at Berkeley, Marshall Colberg of Florida State University, and Emmanuel Weiler of Purdue University (Lewis was one of the three members of the Special Advisory Committee to the Joint Council, along with Bach and Rendigs Fels of Vanderbilt University).[28]

The new Committee on Economic Education of the AEA was part of a renewed commitment on the part of the professional economists. It was also part of the renewed vigor of the 1960s. The creation of the National Task Force on Economic

---

[27]Joint Council, Minutes, September 18, 1961, and January 25, 1962.

[28]Bachs, "Report," AER 55 (May, 1965): 727-30. Bach took over the "crown and sceptre" from Lewis and bore them nobly for the next fifteen years.

Education and the release of its Report in 1961 had called the nation's attention to the issue. It also served to rally the forces supporting improved economic education and gave them a published document that suggested guidelines for further improvements. In 1964 the Joint Council began its multi-million dollar DEEP curriculum project; in 1965 the Atlanta conference was held at which time The Handbook for the Centers for Economic Education was prepared, and in 1969 the first conference for center directors was held. All during this time the network of councils was expanding, and efforts were being concentrated on organizing state councils where there were before local or regional ones. Economists in colleges and universities were called upon to provide assistance in all of these projects.

The economics profession was also re-examining the methods of instruction in undergraduate courses. Part of the problem centered on the question of what was the best way to train future teachers to teach economics in their classrooms, while for others the problem was to determine the appropriate content of general education classes. The investigation by the AEA in the 1940s of the undergraduate teaching of economics, which had helped spur the creation of the Joint Council, had to cope with the problem of defining undergraduate economics: as Lawrence Leamer, one of the committee members, asked, "is our problem one of too many objectives, as the Subcommittee on Elementary Courses suggests, or is it still, as A. B. Wolfe

suggested thirty years ago, one of 'lack of functional aims, definite enough to be real'?"[29]

Archibald McIsaac provided one answer to this question in an article published in Social Education that had been prepared in cooperation with the Joint Council. He reviewed the work of the 1953 Riverdale Workshop of the Commission on Economics in Teacher Education, which had decided to develop an introductory course that would be designed for economics majors and would emphasize economic analysis. The course he described became identified as the "Joint Council on Economic Education--suggested course," and started with a brief description of national income analysis. It then looked at economics from the consumer sector (income, distribution, consumer expenditure, living standards, and economic well-being), from the business sector (types of business organizations, price and production policies, profits), and from the public sector (government's role in the economy, fiscal and monetary policy). Finally the rest of the world was studied, concentrating on such topics as trade, foreign exchange, and multi-nationals.[30]

In 1956, writing in the Journal of General Education, Norman F. Keiser, Associate Professor of Social Science and

---

[29]Laurence Leamer, "Round Table on the Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Elementary Economics," AER 41 (May, 1951): 698. Ben Lewis was also a participant at the conference. A. B. Wolfe was the president of the AEA in 1950.

[30]Archibald McIsaac, "The Role of Economics in Undergraduate Education," Social Education 17 (November, 1953), pp. 323-35. The issue included the first publication of the Edwin Nourse article, "Persistent Problems of the American Economy."

Economics at the State University of New York Teachers College at Oswego, compared this proposed format for an introductory course in economics with what he considered a "modified-traditional" format, which he attributed to Frank Knight of the University of Chicago. The latter format was organized around the four basic problems of economic production, which has been the standard pattern for teaching economics.[31] These patterns were only two of many that were used in the college classroom, all of which were zealously defended by the instructors. Meno Lovenstein, of Ohio State University, referred to the confusion the non-specialist could experience in an introductory course where "the elaborate analysis of market price in the chapters on exchange . . . are virtually ignored in the treatment of distribution; . . . that odd character playing the role of government . . . wanders from page to page, looking for context," where there is "partial, unintegrated use of the rational income approach," and there are "unreconciled relations between micro- and macro-economics."[32]

Keiser not only discussed what he considered the two most preferable formats for a first-year course in economics,

---

[31]Norman F. Keiser, "The Role of Economics in General Education," Journal of General Education 9 (April, 1956): 184-86. Keiser, who described the McIsaac-proposed format as the "Joint Council approach," compared the two methods in this article.

[32]Meno Lovenstein, "Round Table on Economics in the Schools," AER 47 (May, 1957): 682. Lowenstein was responding to presentations by Bloom and Lewis at the Round table at the 1956 meeting of the AEA.

but also examined other methods for getting economic content in the general education curriculum. Besides the first-year course mentioned above, which would have to be generalized enough to meet the limited interests of the students not intending to major in economics, he described three other possible methods. First, all students might be required to choose some options from a select group of social science courses, among which would be included an introductory course in economics. Second, some amount of economics might be included in the social science courses from which the students would be required to make a selection, without offering a separate course in economics. Third, a general social science course might be offered, demonstrating that the various disciplines interrelate in contemporary problems.

For all three possibilities, though, Keiser offered some reasons for being cautious in offering them as the final answer to the problem. For the first possibility, the selection-from-options, it was possible that the students might not choose to select the course in economics, in which case there was no gain made in economic literacy.[33] In the second, that of improving economic content in the other courses, there was a great likelihood of vagueness and confusion. And in the third, the general social science course, the various disciplines would have to be integrated very carefully or again

---

[33]There still remained the further problem of designing an appropriate introductory course. Some economists have considered the issue of requiring choices in a discipline that studies free market choice.

confusion would be the likely result. The solution that Keiser favored was either the third choice or an improved economics course.[34] In the next twenty years the issue of economics in general education, and the responsibilities of the academic economists to the non-specialists taking the introductory courses, was increasingly being raised and considered. The greatest contribution of the Joint Council during the 1950s lay in providing a meeting ground for those who were involved with the discussion of the issue. Edward Allen, the Director of the College and University Program until 1959, felt that the discussion was beginning to bring more tangible results. In 1957 he reported that after exposure to the college-level conferences the Joint Council had sponsored or co-sponsored, the following changes had taken place: about 90% of the participants abandoned the encyclopedic method of teaching, 53% changed toward a problem-oriented approach, 73% discontinued or modified the lecture presentation, 67% increased student participation, 33% employed pupil-teacher planning, and 57% modified their evaluation procedures.[35]

He also reported that 90% of the respondents were planning for, or offered, quarter or semester courses for future teachers. This figure, as well as the others listed above, represented a subjective self-evaluation by those economists

---

[34]Keiser, "Role of Economics," Journal of General Education, pp. 180-84.

[35]Edward J. Allen, "Program of the Joint Council on Economic Education," Journal of Higher Education 30 (February, 1959): 98.

who responded to the mail survey that Allen conducted. There was apparently no post-survey evaluation of the changes mentioned above, and no indication of how permanent the changes were. Whether they resulted from wishful thinking or the desire to appear helpful and encouraging, or whether they did indeed represent a deep-seated alteration of methods and goals, they at least indicate some support for change. The figures Allen reported resulted from the conferences and workshops of the late 1950s. The National Task Force Report in 1961, and the American Economy television series in 1962-63, seemed to awaken more interest in the teaching of economics. The American Economic Association's support of economic education was demonstrated in the re-establishment of the Committee on Economic Education in 1963, under the leadership of G. L. Bach. This committee worked closely with the Joint Council from its inception in a joint effort to ensure that the figures given in the Allen survey would reflect the actual situation in the teaching of economics in colleges and universities. From the mid-1960s this effort concentrated especially on developing new methods for teaching economics in the introductory courses in the colleges and universities, and on improving the economic background of college students who were planning to teach in the public schools.

An important step in this process was the development of an evaluation instrument that would allow the measurement of gains made from instruction in college economics courses. The Test of Economic Understanding (TEU) that had been completed in 1965 had been prepared for use in the secondary

schools and measured what economists considered "common sense" knowledge. What was needed next was a test that could be used to determine higher levels of understanding. In 1965 the Joint Council made an agreement with the Psychological Corporation to prepare such a test, and with the advice of the Committee on Economic Education of the AEA the Joint Council appointed a committee to supervise its construction.

Rendigs Fels, of Vanderbilt University, was designated as chairman, and Paul Dressel, of Michigan State University, was the Executive Director. Other members were George L. Bach, of Carnegie Institute of Technology (also the chairman of the Committee on Economic Education), William Bowen, of Princeton University, Robert A. Gordon, of the University of California at Berkeley, Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and George Stigler, of the University of Chicago. Assisting them from the Joint Council were Glenn E. Burress, the Director of the College and University Program, and Hulda Grobmann, the Director of Evaluation. The consultant for the committee was John Stalmaker, of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, who had been the chairman of the committee that had prepared the TEU.[36]

The committee first met in January, 1966, and by the summer of 1968 had completed the test and the field testing. The results were reported at the annual meeting of the AEA in

---

[36]Rendigs Fels, "A New 'Test of Understanding in College Economics,'" AER 52 (May, 1967): 660-66; Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1966.

December, 1968, by Fels and Arthur Welsh, the new Director of the College and University Program of the Joint Council.[37] The new test provided a standardized scale by which gains in economic knowledge could be measured; all economics educators now had a common yardstick with which to work, and research in economic education was greatly facilitated. Using the Test of Understanding in College Economics (TUCE) for both pre- and post-testing, researchers were able to measure the effectiveness of changes in methodology, curriculum design, and textbook use, to cite a few among many variables in pedagogy. The Joint Council also helped establish a national "question bank" from which material for individual tests for classroom use could be drawn. Vanderbilt University, under the direction of Rendigs Fels, administered this project with financial support from a Joint Council grant. There were annual prizes for the best test question submitted to the "bank," and copies of the questions were made available at no cost to any college or university professor who requested.[38]

The TUCE, and the question bank, were important contributions to improved economics instruction in the colleges, but they were still peripheral to the important problem of improving the ability of secondary school teachers to teach economics in the public schools. In-service education was still the main thrust of the Joint Council effort to help the teachers.

---

[37]Rendigs Fels and Arthur L. Welsh, "Performance on the New TUCE," AER 59 (May, 1959): 218-29.

[38]Bach, "Report," AER 60 (May, 1970): 515-16.

In 1970 George Dawson conducted a survey of the pre- and in-service programs of the affiliated councils and centers. Nineteen councils responded to his survey questionnaire, which accounted for approximately 90% of all council expenditures. The average expenditure for the pre-service program was 7% of the annual budget, though three councils reported spending as much as 25% of their budget on this program. Of the fifty-seven centers for economic education then in existence, twenty-five responded, reporting that they devoted 86% of their funds to in-service projects and 14% to the pre-service program. To compound the problem, of the twenty-five top producers of initially-certified teachers, and of the twenty top producers of high-school teachers, only seven campuses had centers.[39]

The pre-service program was thus still only a relatively small part of the Joint Council program after twenty years of existence, though important commitments were being made. The in-service program, still the predominant approach to improving teacher competencies in economics, was offering incentives and opportunities for teachers to improve their skills. But the number taking part every year was still only 1% of a profession in which the annual growth rate varied from 2.8% to 4.5%, and in which the turnover rate averaged 8% a year. And only a few states were checking up on the participants after their in-service experience to determine if their teaching, or

---

[39]George Dawson, "Pre-service, In-service, and Graduate Programs in Economic Education," New York, 1970 (mimeographed), pp. 3-4.

student learning, was any better than it had been before.[40] Despite these limiting factors, economic education had to rely on "converting" experienced teachers through in-service programs because of several obstacles they faced in teacher preparation.

First was the difficulty, already discussed, of defining the appropriate level of economics to be taught to non-specialist college students. The search for ways to improve secondary school economic education was being repeated in the colleges and universities, as more faculty became aware of the low level of economic literacy among their students. New course programs were being suggested, attempted, and evaluated. In 1967 the Joint Council, with the support of the Economic Education Advisory Committee of the AEA, approved four experimental courses for its support. At Stanford University, Bach, Richard Attiyeh, and Keith Lumsden conducted a national study on programmed learning; at the University of Michigan, Robert Fusfeld conducted an analysis of the effectiveness of small group teaching relative to large group teaching, with a reading-tutorial method of instruction; at San Jose State, Suzanne Wiggins attempted to restructure a college course using the experimental high school program, "Econ 12," as a model, and emphasizing the training of teachers;[41] and at Carnegie

---

[40] E. S. Wallace, "The Preparation of High School Teachers of Economics," Journal of Economic Education 2 (Spring 1970): 70-71.

[41] Wiggins had been the consultant for the Contra Costa, California, DEEP project, where she had helped develop the semester-long experimental course.

Institute of Technology, Philip Saunders planned a substantial study of the lasting effects of the college elementary courses.[42]

The last named issue, the lasting effects of college courses, was being regarded as one of the crucial problems in determining the appropriate level of instruction for future school teachers. In a preliminary survey, Bach and Saunders had administered the Test of Economic Understanding, which was used at the high school level and measured what economists considered "common-sense" knowledge, to a selected group of teachers. All of the teachers had been out of college for five years. No difference in knowledge of economics appeared between those who had had only a semester or a year course and those who had no economics courses at all; a difference was barely noticeable in the case of those who had had up to two years of instruction; only with five semester courses, or fifteen hours, did there seem to be a substantial difference.[43] A new element in teacher-preparation seemed to be needed: a single course, of either semester or year length, was simply inadequate for effective preparation of teachers. A program

---

[42]Joint Council, Minutes, June 6, 1967; Bach, "Report," AER 58 (May, 1968): 723. In the summer of 1968 Stanford University was the host of a conference on improving methodology of college economics instruction. The GE Foundation gave financial support. The papers presented were edited by Lumsden and published. See Keith Lumsden, ed., Recent Research in Economic Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[43]George L. Bach and Philip Saunders, "Lasting Effects of Economics Courses at Differing Types of Institutions," AER 56 (June, 1966): 570-86.

consisting of fifteen hours was necessary for there to be lasting results, and to achieve such a program involved more than the cooperation of interested economists scattered around the country.

In 1967 George Dawson, then Director of the Center for Economic Education at New York University, conducted a survey of institutions with teacher training programs. This survey, which included responses from schools preparing at least 60% of teacher trainees, offered an interesting and distressing contrast to the findings of Bach and Saunders. Over a third (36%) of the institutions had not required any economics instruction for their teacher-trainees. The situation was only marginally better when social-studies teacher-trainees alone were considered: about half were required to take any economics instruction, usually a 3- or 6-hour course being sufficient, and only one out of ten of those who were not required to do so took economics courses voluntarily. In the nation as a whole, only half of the 60,000 social studies teachers had had any formal economics instruction.[44] And five years later, in another survey, Dawson found that 29 states required no courses in economics for social studies teachers.

One of the states that did attempt to increase the economic proficiency of its teachers was California. In 1966 an advisory seminar recommended to the State Board of Education that all future teachers of secondary social studies and

---

[44]George Dawson, "A Survey of State Teacher Certification Requirements in Economics," New York, 1970 (mimeographed), pp. 5-8.

business education receive as a minimum a three-course, nine-semester-hour sequence of instruction in economics. The sequence would include a non-traditional basic course, which would have a "laboratory supplement." In the laboratory the departments of economics and education would cooperate in providing instruction for teaching economics in the schools. The other two courses would cover contrasting economic systems and an advanced treatment of contemporary economic problems.[45] The acceptance of this program constituted the strongest statement of state support for increasing economic preparation of teacher trainees. The report of the Advisory Seminar to the State Board was widely dispersed to other states and separate teacher-training institutions. In June, 1969, a special interdisciplinary institute was held under the auspices of the Committee on Economic Education of the AEA. The institute suggested that the California program be widely publicized, and the Joint Council acted on this by mailing the report to every department of economics in the country.[46]

A number of colleges and universities were working to improve their individual programs, but a study in 1975 indicated some of the difficulties that they were having. Dennis Weidenaar, the Director of the Center for Economic Education at Purdue University, found that over two-thirds of all college and university social studies educators had had fewer than two

---

[45]Dawson, "Pre-service Programs," New York, 1970 (mimeographed), p. 11.

[46]Bach, "Report," AER 60 (May, 1970): 515-16.

courses in college-level economics, and over one-fifth had had none at all. Among those who had had some instruction, one-half reported that it had been done more than twelve years before. It appeared that teachers who were inadequately prepared were not going to be effective transmitters of economic skills to teacher-trainees. And unfortunately it seemed that there had been little development of interest in economics after the completion of the college career: the vast majority of instructors had never attended a program to increase their understanding of economics.[47] To ameliorate the situation somewhat, Weidenaar found that 40% of the instructors felt a "great need" for better economic education among college and university educators, and 90% expressed a personal interest in attending a program for improving their economic understanding. The survey revealed an attitude favorable to the program of the Joint Council, but it demonstrated the size of the problem.

Colleges and universities have developed other programs to support economic education. The University of Minnesota, for example, offered a Graduate Intermediate Economics Program for teachers who were interested in building on their

---

[47]Dennis Weidenaar, The Role of Economic Education in the Professional Activities of College and University Social Studies Educators--Paper N. 490 West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, Institute for Research in the Behavioral, Economic Management Sciences, 1975, cited in James A. Mackey, Allen D. Glenn, and Darrell R. Lewis, "Current and Future Trends for Teacher Training in Economic Education," Perspectives on Economic Education, Donald R. Wentworth, W. Lee Hansen, and Sharryl H. Hawke, eds. (New York: Joint Council, 1977): 199-200.

participation in summer workshops. It developed a course of study that would lead to a degree in economic education, and also, it required all candidates to participate in a one- or two-year internship with a center for economic education. Ohio University instituted a year-long Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program in Economic Education, with the aim of providing leaders for councils and centers. Many institutions were now offering graduate degrees in economic education.[48] The development of programs such as these was intended to train teachers before they entered the profession, or to encourage them to enhance their professional standing by offering post-graduate economic education degrees and training. One simple alternative to these programs was suggested by E. S. Wallace, of the University of Nebraska. He proposed that the Joint Council or affiliated councils consider endowing faculty positions at key institutions. The major responsibility of these persons would be to design and teach the elementary economics courses that would prepare future teachers or provide economic instruction for other non-specialist students.[49]

As of 1980, the main thrust of the Joint Council pre-service program as it related to the public schools had been in the direction of encouraging the development of new elementary courses for non-specialists, and in encouraging the improved preparation of teachers. This program involved

---

[48]Dawson, "Pre-service Programs," New York, 1970 (mimeographed), pp. 14-18.

[49]E. S. Wallace, "The Preparation of Teachers," p. 74.

contacts with college and university economics and education departments, establishment of centers of economic education on college campuses (though these centers were not solely, or even largely, preoccupied with teacher preparation), cooperation with professional associations of college and university economists and educators, and state departments of public education. The excellent record of the Joint Council in promoting sound, non-biased instruction in economics had earned the respect and cooperation of college faculties. And the decentralized network of the Joint Council had enhanced its ability to work with the varying states and their university systems on "local terms."

In the 1970s no new projects were added to the pre-service program that involved the secondary schools. Instead the emphasis was on the continuation and expansion of the earlier programs. The growth in the number of centers meant that more institutions benefited from these specialized agencies. More college faculty members were encouraged to become more aware of their responsibility for improving economic literacy among college students, some of whom then went on to become teachers. The major new project of the Joint Council was the Teacher-Training Program, with the major objective of preparing graduate students in economics to be better teachers. Indirectly this benefited the public schools, because these new faculty members were taught the importance of teaching, which resulted in better college teaching and sympathy for the needs of other economics teachers. The pre-service program of the Joint Council has played a secondary role in its campaign to

improve economics teaching in the schools, but it has been an important part of the overall economic education movement. And it has made significant contributions towards the goal of greater economic literacy among this country's citizens.

CHAPTER 5

MATERIALS PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION

The initial concept of the Joint Council was that of a service agency with the goal of improving the teaching of economics in the nation's schools. As the Joint Council developed over the years it expanded its program to better achieve this goal, but the general concept of service and support continued to be the key. The process of change attracted the energy of the economists and educators who strove to improve the economic literacy of the American public. To this end, the in-service program dealt with teachers already actively involved in teaching, and the college and university program with teacher-candidates being prepared for service in the teaching profession. The Joint Council has offered other major benefits to the economic education movement through the preparation and/or publication of supplemental and audio-visual materials, teacher's guides, and evaluations of textbooks and other teaching materials.

In 1949, when the Joint Council was organized, there was an abundance of material offered to the public school teachers to supplement the textbooks available for classroom use. Unfortunately, most of the material was produced by groups which were more concerned with the presentation of particular versions of economic wisdom than with economic

analysis and understanding. The materials came from varied sources. A great number were produced by individual corporations, trade associations, farm organizations, and labor unions. Many research institutes published either separate studies or a series of studies. These included the Committee for Economic Development, Brookings Institute, Resources for the Future, and the Twentieth Century Fund. A third major source of materials was the network of agencies of the federal government, and in the mixed economy that emerged from the Second World War these agencies were both numerous and vocal. They included the Federal Reserve System, the various departments of the President's Cabinet, and the many regulatory commissions. Finally, many universities produced materials prepared by their departments of economics or business research.[1]

Supplemental materials are valuable sources of information that can be used in a classroom to demonstrate varying opinions and points of view, and to deepen the understanding of the modern market system. But they are "supplemental" and not "central," and the limitation indicated above should not have been too great a problem were the "central" features of the classroom instruction at least adequate. The "central"

---

[1] Report of the Materials Evaluation Committee: Study Materials for Economic Education, by Lewis E. Wagner, Chairman (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1961), pp. 2-4; Charles W. Merrifield, "Economic Competence: New Frontiers in Civic Education," Social Education 23 (February, 1959): 71-74. Merrifield was the Associate Director of the Joint Council and Wagner had been a leading figure in many projects of the Joint Council.

features of classroom instruction remain the teacher and the textbook, and these were not adequate to the task of improving economic literacy. The inadequacy of teacher preparation and competence has already been indicated: two aspects of this inadequacy were of importance when considering the problem of instructional materials. First, under-prepared teachers were unable to selectively choose from the numerous materials offered to them or available to them. Thus special-interest groups could offer a wide array of facts to the teacher, and then to the student, consideration of which would lead to more confusion than understanding. Second, these same teachers would not be able to generate their own materials to supplement textbook instruction.

The Joint Council attempted to improve the preparation of teachers for service in the schools, and worked to improve teaching in the schools. Along with these activities came the attempt to improve teacher-produced materials. At the earliest workshops the participants, both teachers and consultants, spent the middle part of the day working toward the development of materials which the teacher could use in the classrooms. This practice met with mixed success. It has already been shown that fifteen semester hours of economics was required for there to be any lasting effects: the workshop participants who had had less economic instruction than fifteen hours, and these were the vast majority, simply did not know, or remember, enough economics to be put to effective use in preparing materials. On the other hand, as more teachers did benefit from in-service workshops, and as the growing network of

affiliated councils was more able to provide follow-up support to interested and concerned teachers, the opportunity for producing good materials was greatly improved.

One of the side-effects of the DEEP program was the organized production of materials which were made available to an entire local school system, and the best of which were made available to all the nation's schools through the Joint Council. Also, the Kazanjian Foundation Annual Award Program (now the International Paper Company Foundation Awards) recognized and rewarded superior teacher-produced materials which the Joint Council publicized in the annual booklet entitled Economic Education Experiences of Enterprising Teachers.[2]

The Joint Council has acted on its basic philosophy in three important ways in the production and evaluation of classroom materials. It has made every effort to encourage the teaching of economics appropriate to the pre-college level of understanding, accepting, and requesting the help and advice of both economists and educators; it has not accepted the support or furthered the cause of any special-interest groups; and it has encouraged the development of economic education materials at the local level.

The search for the appropriate level of economics instruction has been carried out in the area of materials production as well as in all the other areas of the economic education movement. Hampering this search has been the

---

[2]For the awards program see pp. 161-64.

continuing problem of defining "economic literacy." In 1976, at the National Conference on Needed Research and Development in Precollege Economic Education, W. Lee Hansen discussed the difficulty of arriving at an operational definition:

> Although the lack of a definition comes as no surprise, it is difficult to explain. Perhaps economists are lazy, preferring to spend their time on other things. Perhaps economists have already attempted and given up on what appears to be a difficult task: traces of such efforts are reflected by the imprecise statements found in most textbook introductions. . . . I am not certain which of these explanations is most appropriate. It does seem clear that as educators we should try . . . to develop an operational measure of it.[3]

Despite this difficulty, or because of it, the Joint Council has supported the publication and distribution of materials that contain sound economic principles. In 1951, Julian Aldrich, Professor of Education at New York University, was appointed a consultant for publication, and he worked closely with representatives from both the Committee for Economic Development and the National Council for the Social Studies to prepare and edit materials for publication. In 1953 the National Council published World Trade: Goals and Problems, which had been co-authored by Aldrich and Sylvia Stone, a research economist for the CED.[4] In 1952 Laurence Senesh became the staff economist of the Joint Council, and

---

[3]W. Lee Hansen, "The State of Economic Literacy," in Perspectives on Economic Education, ed. Donald Wentworth, W. Lee Hansen, and Sharryl H. Hawke (New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1977), p. 63.

[4]Joint Council, Newsletter, January, 1954. The Teachers Guide was one of a series published by the National Council for the Social Studies.

participated in the editing of many works: in 1956 he produced the first filmstrip to be directly prepared by the Joint Council. And in 1954 the Joint Council appointed a publications committee to help advise in the selection and preparation of materials for publication. This committee consisted of James Calderwood, of the Joint Council; Stone, of the CED; Martin R. Gainsburgh, of the National Industrial Conference Board; Soloman Barkin, of the Textile Workers Union; Arnold Bellach, of Teachers College of Columbia University; and Helen Flynn, the Director of Curriculum of the Great Neck, New York Public Schools.[5]

From the very beginning, therefore, respected economists and educators from the academic and business world assisted in the production of materials for the Joint Council. There was not always total agreement on publication decisions made by the staff of the Joint Council and the publication committee. Early in 1960 Frankel announced to the Executive Committee that U.S. Steel was interested in financing "The Role of American Investments," one of a series of filmstrips the Joint Council was producing. Dean Emmanuel Weiler, of Purdue University had expressed an interest in preparing the manuscript, and the publication committee had reviewed his draft outline and suggested some changes. At this point one of the members of the Executive Committee pointed out that no member of the committee was "in a field directly dealing in profits." This statement

---

[5]Joint Council, Newsletter, April, 1954.

was followed by a brief flurry of comments that revolved around the main theme of the unhappiness of businessmen with many school economics classes, which in their eyes were no more than "bull sessions on what was wrong with business." Frankel pointed out that it was exactly this situation that the Joint Council was working to correct, but he agreed to re-examine the membership and role of the publications committee. In 1963, this work was turned over to the Special Advisory Committee made up of economists nominated by the AEA.[6]

In 1973 another potential conflict surfaced that involved more than the question of sound economic doctrine in materials prepared for the Joint Council, but which can serve to demonstrate the difficulty in this area of activity. This time it was an organized labor representative on the Executive Committee who voiced concern. Among other issues, he was unhappy with a recent draft of "The World Economics," a booklet by James Calderwood written to accompany a filmstrip in the series, Economic Issues in American Democracy. In effect, he felt that the author was too supportive of what organized labor construed as "shipping jobs overseas," and he wanted several of the parts treated in the material to be reconsidered and rewritten. Frankel agreed that the staff would re-examine this issue and respond to the Executive Committee. In April, 1974, Frankel reported that Calderwood was being asked to make some

---

[6]Joint Council, Minutes, February 11, 1960. The member of the Executive Committee who made the comment that stirred the discussion was the Chairman of the Executive Committee from 1967 until 1978.

changes in his draft but that an overall problem remained: what was to be done if an overwhelming number of the members of the Executive Committee approved of the publication but only a few disapproved? The changes were made and the Joint Council continued to represent a consensus of all the sectors of the economic community. But the problem lurked beneath the surface to threaten the success and program of the Joint Council.[7]

Another important part of the basic philosophy of the Joint Council that was carried out in the publications program was related to the conflicts just mentioned. The Joint Council attempted to avoid "selling" any special-interest version of economics. By selecting economists and educators recognized for their academic credentials to be involved with the preparation of materials published by the Joint Council, this problem of special interests was largely avoided. But it was in the area of materials evaluation that the Joint Council played a leading role. There were several such evaluations, described later in this chapter, and by putting its imprimatur on certain "approved" items of supplementary materials the Joint Council indirectly encouraged their use in place of any materials not so endorsed.

The third major part of the philosophy on which the Joint Council acted was the goal of local responsibility for materials publication. The Joint Council from the beginning tried to assist individual teachers in the preparation of their own materials. This was done especially in the earliest

---

[7]Joint Council, Minutes, November 17, 1973, and April 19, 1974.

workshops where the format encouraged teacher preparation of classroom materials after sessions had been held stressing certain economic concepts. Also from the very beginning, but more especially after the inception of the DEEP Program was begun, local systems were provided guidance and assistance in developing curriculum materials that were appropriate to the needs of the local schools. And after the network of councils and centers had become broadly spread over the country, this practice of local materials development became more easily facilitated. Various councils either aided local systems in the production of materials or themselves produced materials drawn from local sources. Materials preparation became one of the central functions of the Centers for Economic Education.

At the same time, however, despite this emphasis on decentralized production and individual preparation, the Joint Council staked out an important area of its own for materials preparation. As already indicated, the Joint Council was early on involved in editing and publishing materials in cooperation with other national organizations. From the start the Joint Council from time to time prepared and published materials that were not otherwise being made available to the schools but were beyond the scope or capability of local systems or individual units of the network of councils and centers. These centrally produced materials, written by respected economists and educators, and stressing the teaching of sound economic doctrine, have been an invaluable asset to teachers throughout the country.

And yet there remained problems. There was never a nationwide, large-scale project to develop economic education materials, such as was done with geography, anthropology, and political science during the 1960s. At the New Orleans conference held in February, 1976, the participants drew up a list of recommendations to be brought to the attention of all persons interested in economic education. One of these recommendations called for a more extensive program of materials development, especially at the national level. The conference participants felt that one or more national projects would serve as models for other, less ambitious, projects. Even more strongly, the feeling was expressed that more research was needed on the use of economic education materials: teacher and student attitudes towards economics needed to be determined in order to provide materials that would address these attitudes most effectively.[8]

The first publications of the Joint Council concerned the initial development of workshops and were designed for use by staff administrators and personnel. These included a booklet of digests of presentations at four early workshops, the 1948 and 1949 New York University Conferences held at Riverdale School, and the 1949 conferences held at the University of Minnesota and Michigan State College. There was also a descriptive outline of the guiding principles of the

---

[8]Donald R. Wentworth and W. Lee Hansen, "Conference Overview," in Wentworth, Perspectives, pp. 8-9. The first recommendation was that economic educators provide a working definition of "economic literacy."

newly-created Joint Council, and a small booklet on recommended scheduling and content for three-week economics workshops.[9] The first "outside" printing venture by the Joint Council involved A Guide to Films in Economic Education, which had been prepared by the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction of the National Education Association but was printed at the expense of the Joint Council in 1952. Two years later when the Joint Council was re-examining its role in the economic education movement and redefining its purpose, this publication was identified as an outstanding example of the direction that any Joint Council materials production program ought to take.[10]

The first major involvement of the Joint Council in materials preparation came in 1953, in a project in cooperation with the National Council for the Social Studies. The project was the Economic Life Series, and the Joint Council used the speech that Edwin Nourse delivered at the annual meeting of the NCSS as a guide in editing this series. The

---

[9]These works were, respectively: Joint Council, Problems of Our American Economy: Digests of Presentations at Economic Education Workshops (New York: Joint Council, 1949); Joint Council, The Improvement of Economic Understanding: New York University Workshop on Economic Education, 1948 (New York: Joint Council, 1948); Joint Council, Recommended Scheduling for Three-week Economic Education Workshops (New York: Joint Council, 1952). The 1952 "handbook" was only seven pages long, was updated in 1955 into a more comprehensive handbook, and was most completely offered to a growing network of affiliated councils in 1965. Since then it has been periodically revised after consultation between council directors and central office staff.

[10]Joint Council, Minutes, August 15, 1952, and September 24, 1954. The Gould Report in 1954 specifically recommended that the Joint Council not spread itself too thin by entering into a broad publications program.

speech was entitled "Persistent Problems of the American Economy," and the series dealt with these large-scale problems. The first publication was World Trade: Goals and Problems, referred to earlier. The first part of this resource unit, that dealt with economic analysis, was written by Sylvia Stone, a Research Economist with the Committee for Economic Development, and the second part, that suggested teaching aids for this topic, was prepared by Julian Aldrich. The second was A Teacher's Guide to Money, Banking and Credit and was co-authored by Thomas O. Waage, of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and Eunice Johns. The last item in this series was A Teacher's Guide to Economic Security for Americans, with the first part written by The American Assembly of the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, and the second part by Laurence Senesh, of the Joint Council.[11]

These items were offered for sale by both the Joint Council and the National Council for the Social Studies. In 1956 the Joint Council produced its first independent piece

---

[11]Sylvia Stone and Julian C. Aldrich, World Trade: Goals and Problems, Economic Life Series, no. 1 (Washington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1953); Thomas O. Waage and Eunice Johns, A Teacher's Guide to Money, Banking and Credit, Economic Life Series, no. 2 (Washington: NCSS, 1955); The American Assembly and Laurence Senesh, A Teacher's Guide to Economic Security for Americans, Economic Life Series no. 3 (Washington: NCSS, 1955). The first book in the series was revised in 1960; James D. Calderwood and Julian C. Aldrich, A Teacher's Guide to World Trade, Economic Life Series, no. 1 (Washington: NCSS, 1960). Another item was later added to this series by the Joint Council but the publisher was the Office of Price Stability. This timely item was The People versus Inflation, and was offered free.

of supplementary material, a filmstrip entitled "Our Growing America," with the script by Laurence Senesh. Completed after a year of research, this 150-panel filmstrip treated the major economic areas of national income analysis, micro-economics, and federal government fiscal policy. It was one of the first pieces of audio-visual material to present an overview of the national economy in an attempt to teach broad economic principles. In producing and publicizing this filmstrip, the Joint Council added a new perspective to the materials available for classroom instruction.

One of the factors contributing to the success it achieved was its artistic quality: it was one of six semi-finalists in the Golden Reel Film Festival Awards for a first venture in the field.[12] Senesh had received art training during his undergraduate years in his native Hungary, and this might have contributed to its artistic quality. Another contributing factor was that the Calvin K. Kazanjian Economic Foundation, Inc., of Westport, Conn., agreed to play a role in the distribution of the filmstrip. It purchased enough copies of the three-part filmstrip set to present it to 1160 selected school systems around the country. This support provided further evidence of the success of the Joint Council in attracting increased financial support for the economic education movement.

Following the success of this first step in the production of their own audio-visual materials, the Joint Council

---

[12]Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1957.

initiated the planning for an entire series to be entitled "The U.S. Economy in Action," with financial support from various organizations, foundations, and corporations. These included Household Finance Corporation, the National Consumer Finance Association, the American Bankers Association, the AFL-CIO, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the U.S. Steel Corporation.[13] The first in the series was "The Role of the Commercial Banking System in the American Economy," with a script by Jerome B. Cohen, of C.C.N.Y., and Weldon Welfling, of Western Reserve. The second was "The Role of Federal Reserve in our American Economy," written by Carl Madden, of Lehigh University, who had at one time been a writer for the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The third, written by Laurence Senesh and Barbara Wane Newell, both of Purdue University, was entitled "The Role of our Labor Force--The Pulse of the Nation." The fourth in the series, also written by an old friend of the Joint Council, Lewis Wagner, was "The Role of Consumers." And the final filmstrip in the series, entitled "The Role of Capital Investment," was written by Emmanuel Weiler, another member of the Purdue University faculty.[14]

---

[13] Joint Council, Minutes, February 11, 1960. The announcement to the Executive Committee of these special-project grants stirred a detailed discussion of the general problem of fund-raising, previously described in this paper.

[14] Joint Council, Newsletter, November, 1960, and November, 1961. When the Special Publications Advisory Committee of the Joint Council questioned some of the points presented in the final filmstrip, one of the members of the Executive Committee questioned the membership of the committee; see pg. 143.

In 1975-76 the Joint Council updated all six of the filmstrips, and they supplemented another series produced in 1972. This series, entitled "Economic Issues in American Democracy," was produced by Educational Enrichment Materials in cooperation with the Joint Council, and comprised five separate filmstrip/booklet sets. This series also demonstrated the ability of the Joint Council to draw upon recognized experts in the economic community for assistance in the production of materials. The set on the role of unions was written by F. Ray Marshall, later to become Carter's Secretary of Labor; the set on unemployment and inflation was written by Herbert Stein who at the time of production of the series was Nixon's Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors; and another set, on the profit system, was by A. D. H. Kaplan, a respected economist with the Brookings Institute. The other two, one about the government's role in our economic system and the other about world trade, were by Ben Lewis and James Calderwood, respectively, both of whom had enjoyed a long relationship with the Joint Council.[15]

There was one other series of educational materials produced for and distributed by the Joint Council. In 1959 a new feature was added to the Newsletter that was published three times every year. For every issue an economist wrote a 2-4 page article on a selected topic, and an educator followed up with guidelines for teaching the topic. The first one was

---

[15]It was Calderwood set on world trade that was the focus of the concern of the labor representatives on the Executive Committee; see pg. 144.

entitled "What about Inflation," and was written by Siona Kagan, the staff economist for the Joint Council; the guidelines were written by Albert Alexander, head of the Social Studies Department at Brooklyn Technical High School (and a participant at the 1948 Riverdale Conference). At first these articles were bound with the rest of the Newsletter, but after several issues they were included as a looseleaf addition. From time to time larger groups of topics were collected, and bound together and made available as a single unit. In 1969 the "Economics Topics" series was expanded in scope. The booklets included from 18 to 24 pages, and in 1972 filmstrips were made available to accompany the booklets. These "Economic Topics" sets were concerned with contemporary economics issues, such as energy, health care, and youth unemployment, and played an important role in classroom instruction concerning these topics.

After the Science-Economics Workshop in 1959, several materials were made available to economics educators through the Joint Council. But it was especially the DEEP schools, beginning in 1964, which presented the Joint Council with a potential for the development and production of a great amount of supplementary materials. The ten model and pilot schools which began this program in 1964, followed by twenty more schools over the next two years, shared as part of their goals the development of effective classroom materials. This was especially true for the three pilot schools of Pittsburgh,

Minneapolis, and Contra Costa, California.[16] The Pittsburgh project was especially able to add new material to the economic education movement. Under the special guidance of G. L. Bach and Philip Sanders, both associated with the Carnegia Institute of Technology, the Pittsburgh school system organized a system of materials development and evaluation that became a model for other systems.

The Joint Council provided guidelines for the development of new materials. It required that any materials developed in a school system be tried and tested within that system, and then strongly urged that these materials be exchanged with other schools participating in DEEP. The Joint Council served as the channeling agency for information about materials developed by the various schools. After these materials had been "proven" within the DEEP system, the question arose of publication and wider dissemination. The Joint Council suggested six criteria: economic principles must be correct and significant; the material must conform to sound educational principles; it must be transferable to other learning situations in other school systems; it must be original and not repeat already-available materials; it must have been

---

[16]The Contra Costa materials never entered the Joint Council distribution network but instead were produced commercially. One of the consultants for Contra Costa did enter the network: William Green became a curriculum specialist with the Joint Council in 1965 and stayed for two years.

evaluated and proven to have "worked;" and it must be well-written.[17]

The participating schools were encouraged to develop their own materials, but unfortunately, major problems were discovered. In the first-year evaluation (conducted after the first ten schools had finished their three-year DEEP involvement) it was noted that materials development was not progressing as well as had been intended. In general, the system coordinators lacked an overview of curriculum development, and materials developed were of low quality, were not transferable, and were not being adequately implemented even in other classrooms in the same school.[18] Eight years after the beginning of the program the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare commissioned reports on twenty-one national curriculum projects. The report on DEEP was generally favorable, but materials development was viewed as a very weak element. It found that in some systems fewer items were being used two years after DEEP than at its close, and that fewer than half of "eligible" teachers were using them. Most systems, and the Joint Council itself, had apparently underestimated the resources required to produce

---

[17]John E. Maher, S. Stowell Symmes, and William Green, DEEP '67: A Progress Report on the Developmental Economic Education Program (New York: Joint Council, 1967), pp. 14-17.

[18]George Hollenbeck, A Report of the First Year Evaluation of the Developmental Economic Education Program of the Joint Council on Economic Education (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1968), pp. 44-45. This Report was commissioned by the Joint Council and was conducted by the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) at the University of Illinois.

quality curriculum materials.[19] The Joint Council published several DEEP items from the late 1960s, and several remained available from the Joint Council in 1980, but this source of materials was never as productive as was originally intended.

In its own small way the materials development aspect of DEEP mirrored problems noted in many other, more elaborate, curriculum projects. As Hensen and Wentworth commented in the overview of the 1976 New Orleans Conference,

> Numerous examples exist of curriculum projects in the 1960s and 1970s which spent thousands of dollars developing curricular materials that are not being used and which have not added appreciably to our knowledge of the educational process. In most cases, the projects did not include a thoughtful research component, evaluation process, or installation strategy. These missing links in the development process created severe bottlenecks when it was found that teachers did not know about these materials, did not want them, and did not have confidence in their effectiveness or could not use them.[20]

And one of the speakers at the Conference spoke of his personal knowledge of one such project. In 1966 Meno Lovenstein produced Economic Curricular Materials as a project under the U.S. Office of Education Project Social Studies. This detailed ninth-grade course had scarcely been used since its completion, despite the high quality of the materials.[21] The materials

---

[19]Yungho Kim and Daniel W. Kratochvil, Product Development Report No. 16: Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) (Palo Alto, Cal.: American Institutes for Research, 1972), p. 33.

[20]Hansen and Wentworth, Perspectives, p. 13.

[21]Harris L. Dante, "A Response to 'Current and Future Needs for Teacher Training in Economic Education,'" in Hansen and Wentworth, Perspectives, pp. 217-18. The Lowenstein project is reported in Social Education, 34, no. 4 (April, 1970): 418-20. Both Dante and Lowenstein taught in Ohio and had worked with the Ohio Council on Economic Education, one of the most active in the country.

development aspect of DEEP thus shared the major weakness of many other projects: what it lacked in product quality, however, was at least partly compensated for in the process of change that was also part of DEEP. Other gains outweighed this loss, and the Joint Council made up the loss through the production of its own materials, as already described.

There were three other major supporting roles that the Joint Council played in the production of classroom materials. It supported committees which evaluated supplementary materials produced by other agencies, it instituted an awards program to honor enterprising economics teachers, and it began the publication of a journal devoted entirely to the topic of economic education.

The materials evaluation program was preceded by a project of the American Economic Association. In 1959 the Ford Foundation gave $35,000 to the AEA for the special purpose of studying the textbooks used in the secondary schools, with the aim of suggesting improvements that could be made in economics instruction contained therein. Under the direction of Paul Olson, of Iowa, the committee appointed for the evaluation worked in three sections. It examined economics textbooks, United States history textbooks, and textbooks for the general social problems courses. The work of the committee was finished in 1961 and the Report published in 1963 as a special supplement to the American Economic Review. The committee criticized all of the publications for their superficial treatment of economics, for the most part limiting it

to a descriptive account without adequate analysis.[22]

At about the time when this committee was finishing its Report the Joint Council asked the AEA to recommend economists to be members of a Study Materials Evaluation Committee which it was organizing. The purpose of the Committee was to collect all the non-textbook materials that were available to the schools from research foundations, government agencies, labor groups, corporation and trade associations, and international organizations, and recommend specific ones that would be of use to the schools. This Committee, with Lewis Wagner an active chairman,[23] assembled over 7,000 items at the Bureau of Economic Education at the University of Illinois, and selected ninety-seven as most appropriate for school use. It established three main criteria for determining the appropriateness of material for use in the schools, these being: 1) were the materials genuinely concerned with economic matters; 2) were

---

[22] Economics in the Schools: A Report by a Special Textbook Study Committee of the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Association, by Paul Olson, AER 53 (March, 1963), ix-xii. Since so many secondary textbooks were written by academic economists, this "in-house condemnation" was more directly felt, and this Report played an important role in the considerable improvement that would be noticeable in later years.

[23] Besides Wagner, the members of this Committee were: 1) Albert Alexander, New York City schools; 2) Edgar Edwards, Rice University; 3) Herbert Heaton, University of Minnesota; 4) Earl S. Johnson, University of Wisconsin; 5) John Lawrence, Los Angeles County schools; 6) Shorey Peterson, University of Michigan; 7) Philip Taylor, University of Connecticut. Alexander, Peterson, and Taylor had had many contacts with the Joint Council, and Lawrence went to the Joint Council in 1963 to become the Director of Curriculum, where he played a central role in the development of the DEEP project.

they analytical in nature; 3) were they appropriate for high school use?[24] On the accepted list were items from the Committee for Economic Development (five), the AFL-CIO (four), the Federal Reserve System (four), the Brookings Institute (three), and federal government agencies (nine).[25] The list, reflecting the philosophy of K-12 involvement in economic education, was published by the Committee for Economic Development and was widely accepted among school systems throughout the nation.

The Joint Council acted as the distributor for the pamphlets selected by the Materials Evaluation Committee for three years, at the end of which time the remainder were turned over to Prentice-Hall for sale at reduced prices. The Joint Council was too busy with its expanding program to continue to act as the intermediary between publisher and consumer.[26] There remained a great demand for the materials, and there arose a demand from within the network of councils and centers that the Committee be reactivated. It was decided that the staff of the Joint Council would periodically review materials and issue bulletins on selected items.[27]. But this procedure

---

[24]Wagner, Report, pp. 2-6. The Kazanjian Foundation financed the distribution of the Report, the National Task Force Report, and 47 of the 97 recommended items to 25,000 schools around the country.

[25]Schriftgiesser, Role of the CED, p. 208. No materials from the National Association of Manufacturers were approved by the Committee, which caused that Association to severely criticize this publication of the CED and further widen the gap between these two business organizations.

[26]Joint Council, Minutes, June 11, 1964.

[27]Joint Council, Minutes, July 7, 1965.

proved inadequate and placed an extra burden on the staff for what could be seen as a self-serving mission, so in 1969 it was decided to conduct another evaluation.

This time two committees were established, one for written and one for audio-visual materials. The chairmen were Leon Shur and Sidney Kronish respectively, and the Reports of the committees were published by the Joint Council.[28] Of 5,000 written items submitted to the committee, only 4 percent were deemed acceptable. The Shur Committee found that more acceptable materials were produced by universities, the Federal Reserve System, and government agencies, and fewer were from business and labor organizations. Also, many good items were available for the study of banking and money supply, international trade and finance, and general market operation; too few dealt adequately with urban economic problems, poverty, investment in human capital, comparative economic systems, and agricultural policies.[29] Improvements were forthcoming with audio-visual materials, however. Whereas in 1969 only 10% of the materials had been deemed acceptable, a follow-up three years later judged half of the materials viewed by the Committee as meeting their criteria of objective, analytical presentations of economic principles.[30] As one of the goals

---

[28] Study Materials for Economic Education: Reports of the Materials Evaluation Committees to the Joint Council on Economic Education, by Leon Schur and Sidney Kronish, Chairmen (New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1969).

[29] Schur, Study Materials, p. 4.

[30] Joint Council, Newsletter, March, 1973.

of the Evaluation Committee had been to suggest ways that materials could be improved, it appeared that this project had a positive effect in the classroom.

As indicated earlier, the Joint Council had always encouraged teachers and local school systems to produce their own materials. Although teacher-produced materials, either through individual effort or as a result of workshop experiences, more often than not were inadequately researched and evaluated, nevertheless the potential was always present for work of a high quality to be produced. As more councils held more workshops, and as more teachers were better prepared before even entering the profession, the potential for success became increasingly great. In 1962 the Joint Council began a program to solicit outstanding individually-produced materials by offering rewards for those deemed superior by a selection committee. With a grant from the Calvin K. Kazanjian Economics Foundation, Inc., the Joint Council announced the competition that was to be held in three categories, elementary, secondary, and college teaching.[31] Teachers from twenty-seven states submitted entries, and the prizes to the winners were presented at the annual luncheon of the American Association of School Administrators. Not only did the innovative teachers receive extra stimulation and the Joint Council receive more

---

[31]Joint Council, Newsletter, February, 1962. The seven-person Committee included the soon-to-be Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Joint Council, and three others who had been involved with the work of the Joint Council since its inception. All were professional educators.

high-quality material it could make available to other enterprising teachers, but this was all brought forcefully to the attention of school administrators at their own banquet.

The Kazanjian Foundation also financed the publication of a volume containing condensed summaries of the entries that had either won prizes or received honorable mention. This volume was then distributed through the Joint Council, so that other teachers could take advantage of the materials and ideas of their imaginative colleagues. As a second phase, all of the entries were collected in a clearinghouse at the New York University Center for Economic Education, for distribution to any person who requested the assistance of prepared, workable materials.[32] The award-winning entries varied from short research units to descriptions of semester or, in some cases, year-long courses in economics. In all cases they embodied the philosophy of the Joint Council, that economics instruction can be spread throughout the curriculum at all levels, and it can be effectively done by knowledgeable, concerned teachers developing their own materials.

The Kazanjian Awards had a ripple effect in the economic education movement. For the winners, there were both personal and professional gains. Respondents to a 1969 survey reported that these awards had brought recognition from employers,

---

[32]George L. Fersh and George G. Dawson, "A Clearinghouse for Creative Ideas in Teaching Economics," The Clearinghouse 41 (April, 1967), pp. 489-90. Fersh edited the first volume in what became an annual series of publications, and Dawson, the Director of the Center for Economic Education at New York University, edited the next thirteen. The "library" was subsequently moved to Ohio University.

some public recognition and publication offers, some increased attention to the role of economics in the school curriculum, and had made some impact on other aspects of the winners' teaching efforts.[33] These positive gains, subjectively determined as they were, could nevertheless be used as an inducement to other teachers to prepare new materials and submit them to the awards program.

The effectiveness of the materials when used by someone other than the developer was not adequately tested. Two such tests were conducted in Minnesota, and both revealed results that could encourage further use of the materials. Andrew Nappi and Robert Highsmith were both convinced that using selected materials with in-service education programs resulted in better teaching methods that carried over into better student understanding.[34] Whatever the results of surveys or studies, the Joint Council has regarded the awards program as a worthwhile endeavor. After twelve years of

---

[33]George G. Dawson, The Impact of the Kazanjian Awards Program on Winners (New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1970), pp. 2-5. The questionnaire was sent to 233 winning individuals and 134 responded, including two-thirds of the first-place winners.

[34]Andrew Nappi, "An Evaluation of Award-Winning Elementary Teaching Materials from the Kazanjian Program," Journal of Economic Education 5 (Spring, 1974), pp. 82-88; Robert Highsmith, "A Study to Measure the Impact of In-Service Institutes on the Students of Teachers who have Participated," Journal of Economic Education 5 (Spring, 1974), pp. 77-81. Though both studies were statistically acceptable, there were some limitations: the total number of students checked was 583, and 21 experimental teachers were compared with 17 control teachers. Much more research is needed before any conclusions can be definitely stated.

financial support the Kazanjian Foundation notified the Joint Council that it would prefer to withdraw from the program if another supporter could be found, so as to be able to contribute more funds to other, newer projects. The Joint Council secured the support of the International Paper Company Foundation and the program continued.

The last major contribution the Joint Council made to the preparation or dissemination of economic education materials was the publication of a biennial journal devoted in its entirety to that subject. The possibility of such a venture was first raised in 1963, when the Sloan Foundation was asked whether, if funds were obtained from the Ford Foundation, it would match that grant for the purpose of producing a two-year pilot magazine project. There was some concern among the trustees that such a project was too big for the Joint Council to undertake. Frankel assured them that the Joint Council would only set the policy for the publication and would not be directly involved in its production.[35] The magazine was to be called Directions, and the Advisory Committee of the American Economic Association to the Joint Council was asked for its opinion. The Advisory Committee was not sure that the interest among economists was yet broad enough to warrant expectation of their support; it was true that more attention was now being paid to the problem of economic education in both the colleges and the schools but not enough

---

[35] Joint Council, Minutes, December 6, 1963, and January 31, 1964. At the January meeting Frankel was given permission to continue making the necessary arrangements.

planning or research had been accomplished to justify a specialized magazine. Since the Joint Council was at the time at the initiation stage of the DEEP project, and as the Sloan Foundation refused its support, it was decided to shelve the magazine project.

Five years later, after the first stages of the DEEP project had been completed and it was beginning to operate on a continuing basis, and after the network of councils and centers (especially the latter) had grown considerably, the staff of the Joint Council decided to try to revive plans for a magazine. The name selected this time was the Journal of Economic Education, and enough material was on hand at the time to guarantee at least two years of biennial publication. Henry Villard, of the City University of New York, agreed to be the Editor, and John Maher, the former director of the DEEP project, the Managing Editor. The eight-member Editorial Board included Frankel, G. L. Bach, the chairman of the Committee on Economic Education of the AEA, Rendigs Fels, the Executive Secretary of the AEA, and Kenneth Boulding, a past president of the AEA. The first issue was published in November, 1969, and featured articles on college economics. The second issue was put out in the spring of 1970 and also featured the college scene, but the third issue, in the fall of 1970, had many articles that dealt with the situation in the schools.[36]

---

[36]Joint Council, Newsletter, May, 1969.

The Journal did become the leading publication for articles about economic education. Research that might not otherwise have been published was made available to both educators and economists, and this availability spurred research that might otherwise not have been attempted. The Journal became an important system for disseminating new ideas in economic education, although it was not without some pertinent criticism. Laurence Senesh, the veteran campaigner, was concerned that the Journal was becoming so preoccupied with increasing the effectiveness of the collegiate economic principles courses that it was giving no attention to those innovators who might completely replace this kind of a course with new, more imaginative approaches to economic competence. Of even more concern, he felt that the trend was to accept only those articles that contained quantitative measurement, thereby losing the involvement of many qualified teachers who were not able to use this material or did not need it.[37] In other words, he was afraid that an opportunity to combine the efforts of economists and educators for their mutual benefit was being lost, to the ultimate detriment of both groups.

After three decades the Joint Council had become a significant force in the production and dissemination of economic education materials. It was the prime mover in the production of some materials that might not otherwise have

---

[37]Laurence Senesh, "A Response to 'Current and Future Needs for Teacher Training in Economic Education,'" in Hansen and Wentworth, Perspectives, pp. 218-19.

been produced. It helped organize a network of councils and centers that was itself an important source of materials. Through its support of evaluation committees it encouraged the development by private organizations of quality materials while offering guidelines to be considered in the process of preparation. And it publicized and published individual projects that prepared or evaluated new materials for use in the classroom. In these ways the Joint Council performed a valuable service in the area of economic education.

CHAPTER 6

THE JOINT COUNCIL AFTER THIRTY YEARS

The Joint Council celebrated its thirtieth anniversary in 1979, and it had accomplished enough to leave its supporters with a feeling of considerable satisfaction. The goal of having a network of affiliated councils located in every state had been almost accomplished. These councils were carrying out programs of varying quality, and with varying success, but the existence of the network offered the economic education movement a nation-wide service agency available to no other social science discipline.

The affiliated councils were able to work effectively with local school systems and with the state departments of education. They organized workshops for teachers, conducted in-service projects or helped local school systems become part of the DEEP Phase II Cooperating Schools network. They established centers of economic education on college or university campuses; these centers then tapped the skills of economics and education faculty members on these campuses for use in the economic education movement. And the council and center directors formed a "national interest group" linked by the Joint Council which could nurture and develop the movement.

From its inception the Joint Council stressed that its program was to be academically sound, was to further the teaching of unslanted and basic economics, and was to reflect the broad range of economic opinions and interests. Because of this position, the Joint Council had earned the support of leaders in all areas of economic activity: this support was shown in participation on boards of trustees and in financial grants to the Joint Council or to the affiliated councils. Academic economists respected the integrity of the Joint Council program. They participated in projects directed by local councils and centers, or by the Joint Council itself. The participation and support of professional economists created a favorable impression on business and labor leaders, and educators, making the program of the Joint Council more attractive to them. The interaction of community, school, and academic support of locally autonomous units that were part of a nationwide program lent both strength and flexibility to the work of the Joint Council. That "process" of organizing support for improving economic education in the schools had been the greatest success of the Joint Council.

Another area of success was in the improved quality of materials available for use in the classroom. The Joint Council itself produced materials, the councils and centers produced materials, and some of the school systems produced their own materials, especially those participating in the DEEP network. Besides these materials produced by units of the Joint Council program, the Joint Council supported evaluation projects of other economic education materials, and offered

advice and encouragement to textbook publishers to improve the quality of their materials. Finally, the Journal of Economic Education was devoted entirely to that subject and twice a year brought articles of academic quality to interested persons.

The Joint Council was not without problems as it entered its fourth decade of existence. The broad range of support had not been easily achieved, especially at the affiliated council level. The business community had been over-represented on the boards of trustees and there has always been the potential of diverting the thrust of the economic education movement in the direction of espousing "free-enterprise economics." Those responsible for the creation of the Joint Council generally shared the view that new economic realities required an informed voting and consuming public, and they wanted these new realities included in the instruction of economics. In this sense there was some momentum of "reform." After thirty years this momentum could be worn down, or tempered by more functional concerns.

The Joint Council and its network continued to depend on financial support from corporations and foundations, and this support was always subject to change that reflected change in the nation's economic picture. The financial support was considerable, topping $5 million dollars in 1975, but it was never totally assured, increased support was difficult to attain, and the expenditures were not spread evenly throughout the country.

Finally, and most significantly, the immensity of the self-assigned task of improving the economic literacy of the American people had limited the success of the Joint Council. Most teachers were still unprepared to teach economics. If fifteen hours of college credit in economics was necessary to achieve an adequate familiarity with the subject, then only a very few were qualified to teach economics. And students were still not taking economics courses at a level of registration that the Joint Council could deem acceptable. In Ohio, to take only one example, after twenty-five years of solid activity by the Ohio Council, only 20,000 students out of a secondary school population of 912,000 were registered in economics classes; ten thousand more students were taking psychology than were taking economics.[1]

Leonard Silk, a former editor of Business Week and a member of the Editorial Board of the New York Times, expressed the pessimism that might be derived from considering these conditions. At the New Orleans Conference in 1976 that considered needed research and development in precollege economic education, he said

---

[1]Harris L. Dante, "A Response to 'Current and Future Needs for Teacher Training in Economic Education,'" Wentworth, Perspectives, p. 217. The Joint Council at times exaggerated the numbers of students taking economics. In 1965 it stated that 4 1/2 million students were involved in the DEEP program: New York City's one million students made up a large part of the total figure, but only 1,700 students were in classes directly involved with the program. See Edward D. Prehn, "Twenty Years of Economic Education in the New York City Schools: 1945-1965," (Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 1968), p. 117.

> I have spent more years than I like to remember in economic journalism and economic education, as well as in government, and I would like to confess that I think the level of public economic literacy or understanding is no higher than when I began.[2]

But he went on to state that he hoped his work had not been in vain, that with continued work gains could be made, and that not to make the effort would be to run too great a risk. The Joint Council made the effort, prepared the way for continued effort, and made notable accomplishments along the way.

---

[2]Leonard Silk, "A Response to 'The State of Economic Literacy,'" Wentworth, Perspectives, p. 83.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Joint Council

A. Books

Joint Council on Economic Education. DEEP 1969: Perspectives on a 5-Year Experiment in Curriculum Change. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1969.

Joint Council on Economic Education. Education for the Economic Challenges of Tomorrow: A Report of a Symposium in Conjunction with the Tenth Anniversary Observance of the Joint Council on Economic Education. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1959.

Joint Council on Economic Education. Handbook for Center of Economic Education. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1967.

Maher, John E.; S. Stowell Symmes; and William D. Green. DEEP '67: A Progress Report on the Developmental Economic Education Program. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1967.

Shur, Leon, and Sidney Kronish. Study Materials for Economic Education: Reports of Materials Evaluation Committee to the Joint Council on Economic Education. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1969.

Wentworth, Donald R.; W. Lee Hansen; and Sharryl H. Hawke, Perspectives on Economic Education. New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1977.

B. Other Materials

Baker, G. Derwood. "Handbook for Regional Councils on Economic Education" New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1955. (Mimeographed.)

Bienvenue, Harold J. "A Report on Completed Cooperating School Projects." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

Burness, Glenn E. "Handbook on Centers of Economic Education." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

Dawson, George. "Preservice, In-service, and Graduate Programs in Economics Education." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1970.

_____. "Report of Status, Progress and Improvement of Affiliated State Councils." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1975. (Mimeographed.)

Fersh, George L. (ed.). "Resource-Use Policies: Their Formation and Impact." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

Gemmell, James (ed.). "Economics in General Education: Proceedings of the Riverdale Conference." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1954. (Mimeographed.)

Joint Council on Economic Education. Annual Report. 1953-1978.

_____. "Handbook: Joint Council on Economic Education." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1954. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Joint Council on Economic Education: Workshop Handbook." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1952. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Joint Council on Economic Education: Workshop Handbook." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1955. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Minutes of Meetings of the Executive Committee." 1950-1978. (Typewritten.)

_____. Newsletter. 1950-1978.

_____. "Problems of Our American Economy: Digests of Presentations at Economic Education Workshops." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1949. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Recommended Scheduling and Content for Three-Week Economic Workshops." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1952.

_____. "'The American Economy' TV Course: An Appraisal." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1964. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "The Improvement of Economic Understanding." New York: Joint Council on Economic Education, 1948. (Mimeographed.)

II. Books

American Economic Foundation. Economics in Teacher Education: Report of Teacher Education Committee. New York: American Economic Foundation, 1958.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Educating for Economic Competence: A Report Prepared by the ASCD Commission on Education for Economic Competence. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960.

Committee for Economic Development. Economic Education in the Schools: Report of the National Task Force on Economic Education. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1961.

_____. Economic Literacy for Americans: A Program for Schools and for Citizens. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1962.

_____. Study Materials for Economic Education in the Schools: Report of Materials Evaluation Committee. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1961.

Frankel, M. L. Economic Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

Gould, Sherman. An Evaluation Study of the Joint Council on Economic Education. New York: Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1954. (Mimeographed.)

Hallenbeck, George P. Evaluation Report: Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP), Joint Council on Economic Education. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Report of the First Year Evaluation of the Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) of the Joint Council on Economic Education. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Kim, Yungho, and Danial W. Kratochvil. Product Development Report No. 16: Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP). Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1972.

Lumsden, Keith G. (ed.). Recent Research in Economic Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

McKee, C. W., and H. G. Moulton. Survey of Economic Education. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1951.

Schriftgriesser, Karl. Business and Public Policy: The Role of the Committee for Economic Development: 1942-1967. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Warmke, Roman C. and Gerald D. Draayer. Selected Readings in Economic Education. Athens, Ohio: Ohio Council on Economic Education, 1969.

III. Periodicals

Allen, Edward J. "Program of the Joint Council on Economic Education: Economists and Educators Join Forces." Journal of Higher Education XXX, no. 2 (February, 1959): 94-98.

Ayars, Albert L. "A Frontal Attack on Economic Illiteracy." School Executive 72 (February, 1953): 73-75.

Bach, George L. and Philip Saunders. "Economic Education: Aspiration and Achievements." AEA Review 55, no. 3 (June, 1965): 329-56.

Bach, George L. "Economics in the High Schools: The Responsibility of the Profession." AEA Review 51, no. 2 (May, 1961): 590-90.

Bach, George and Philip Saunders. "Lasting Effects of Economics Courses at Differing Types of Institutions." AEA Review 56, no. 3 (June, 1966): 505-10.

Baker, G. Derwood. "Education Citizens for Economic Effectiveness." Citizenship and a Free Society. 30th Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Edited by Franklin Patterson. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1960, pp. 117-39.

_____. "The Joint Council on Economic Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology XXIII, no. 7 (March, 1950): 387-94.

_____. "The Program of the Joint Council on Economic Education." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals XXXIX, no. 210 (April, 1955): 375-80.

_____. "Why Economic Education?" High School Journal XXXVII (November, 1953): 48-54.

Bercher, William E., Jr.; John D. Helmberger; and Jerry L. Thompson. "An Evaluation of a Developmental Economics Education Project Given Limited Data." Journal of Economic Education 6, no. 2 (Spring, 1975): 120-25.

Bradford, William C. "History of Economic Education in Illinois." The Councillor XXI, no. 1 (March, 1960: 7-12.

Brunswick, Ann F. (compiler). "Summary of Findings: Evaluation of College on the Air Course, 'The American Economy,' on the basis of a National Survey of High School Social Studies Teachers."

Coleman, John R. "Economic Literacy: What Role for TV?" American Economic Review LIII, no. 2 (May, 1963): 645-65.

_____. "Program for College of the Air's 'American Economy.'" American Economic Review LII, no. 4 (September, 1962): 940-45.

Cummings, Howard. "Economic Education in the Secondary Schools." The Journal of Educational Sociology 23, no. 7 (March, 1950): 397-401.

Dawson, George. The Impact of the Kazanjian Awards Program on Winners. New York: New York University Center of Economic Education, 1970. (Mimeograph.)

Drucher, Peter F. "The American Economy in the Next 20 Years," Citizenship and a Free Society: Thirtieth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Franklin Patterson, ed. (Washington: NCSS, 1960): 109-16.

Fels, Rendigs. "A New 'Test of Understanding in College Economics.'" American Economic Review LVII, no. 2 (May, 1967): 660-66.

Fersh, George L. and George G. Dawson. "A Clearing House for Creative Ideas in Teaching Economics." The Clearinghouse XLI, no. 8 (April, 1967): 489-90.

_____. "A Three-Year Project in Conservation and Resource-Use Education." Social Education XXII, no. 5 (May, 1958): 253-54.

Fersh, George L. "Report of the Concurrent Session on Collegiate Action-Research Programs in Economic Education." Eighteenth Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington: AACTE, 1965): 189-94.

Frankell, M. L. "The Joint Council on Economic Education: The First Ten Years." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals XLII, no. 240 (October, 1958): 124-28.

Gambold, Willard J. "Issue of Inflation in the Election of 1896." Social Education XVII, no. 7 (November, 1953): 326-28.

Harnly, Paul W. "How Can Economic Education and Understanding be Developed in Curriculum?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals XXXIV, no. 169 (March, 1950): 140-44.

Hersh, Isaac, and William Jansen. "Economic Literacy for all Pupils." Nations Schools LXII, no. 12 (December, 1958): 43-45.

Highsmith, Robert. "A Study to Measure the Impact of In-Service Institutes on the Students of Teachers who have Participated." Journal of Economic Education 5, no. 2 (Spring, 1974): 77-81.

Hollingsworth, Henry T. and Fred D. Cranse, Jr. "Bring Vitality to Your Economics Instruction." School Executive LXXVII, no. 4 (April, 1958): 62-65.

Hunt, Herold C. "Towards Economic Literacy--A Business and School Cooperation." NASSP Bulletin 44, no. 258 (October, 1960): 153-58.

Jones, Donald E. "Economic Education Around the State: Decatur." The Councillor XXI, no. 1 (March, 1960: 12-18.

Jones, Galen. "Requisites for Economic Literacy." NASSP Bulletin 40, no. 267 (February, 1956): 140-44.

_____. "Significant Studies on Economic Education." NASSP Bulletin 39, no. 210 (April, 1955): 369-75.

Keiser, Norman F. "The Role of Economics in General Education." The Journal of General Education IX, no. 3 (April, 1956): 179-87.

Langer, Henry. "Scholastic Teacher Interviews Dr. John R. Coleman about 'The American Economy.'" Senior Scholastic Teachers Edition LXXXI, no. 2 (September 19, 1962): 11-12T.

Leamer, Laurence. "A Brief History of Economics in General Education." American Economic Review XL, no. 5, part 2 (December, 1950): 18-33.

Lewis, Ben W. "Economic Understanding: Why and What?" American Economic Review XLVII, no. 2 (May, 1957): 650-62.

Maher, John E. "DEEP: Strengthening Economics in the Schools." American Economic Review LIX, no. 2 (May, 1969): 230-42.

Melby, Ernest O. "Economic Education is a Must." The Journal of Educational Sociology 23, no. 7 (March, 1950): 378-88.

Merrifield, Charles W. "Economic Competence: New Frontiers in Civic Education." Social Education 23, no. 2 (February, 1959): 71-74.

Nappi, Andrew T. "An Evaluation of Award-winning Elementary Yearly Materials from the Kazanjian Program." Journal of Economic Education 5, no. 2 (Spring, 1974): 82-88.

Nourse, Edwin G. "Analysis of Our Economy: Persistent Problems of the American Economy." Social Education 17, no. 7 (November, 1953): 297-311.

Olson, Paul (ed.). "Economics in the Schools: A Report by a Special Textbook Study Committee of the Committee on Economic Education of the American Economic Associations." AEA Review 53, no. 1, part 2 (March, 1963): 1-117.

Olson, Paul R. "This is Economics in the Schools." American Economic Review LI, no. 2 (May, 1961): 564-70.

Ouelette, Vernon A. "Economic Education in Our Secondary Schools." California Journal of Secondary Education XXXIX, no. 2 (February, 1964): 56-60.

Partridge, E. Dealton. "Report of the Commission on Economics in Teacher Education." Sixth Yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Washington: AACTE, 1953): 100-102.

Sanders, Norris M. and Marlin L. Tanck. "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects." Social Education 34, no. 4 (April, 1970): 383-449.

Saunders, Philip. "The Effectiveness of 'The American Economy' in Training Secondary School Teachers." American Economic Review LIV, no. 4, part 1 (June, 1964): 230-38.

"School by TV Adds Another Subject: American Economy," Business Week, no. 1725 (September 22, 1962): 110.

Schreiber, Maurice H. "Economics Needs Emphasis." Social Education XVII, no. 7 (November, 1953): 333-35.

Silk, Leonard and Robert Nathan. "Efficiency in the Teaching of Economics: The Product." AEA Review 54, no. 2 (May, 1964): 295-330.

Sheet, Julian. "Towards Economic Literacy--A Business and Education Cooperation." NASSP Bulletin 44, no. 258 (October, 1960): 159-65.

Taylor, Horace. "Report of the Committee on the Undergraduate Teaching of Economics." AEA Review 39, no. 3 (May, 1949): 515-18.

Willard, Henry, "Where we now Stand." Journal of Economic Education 1, no. 1 (Fall, 1969): 60-66.

Wagner, Lewis E. "Task Force to Classroom." AEA Review 53, no. 2 (May, 1963): 660-73.

_____. "Testing Economic Knowledge and Attitudes." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals XL, no. 220 (May, 1956): 120-32.

Wallace, Edgar S. "The Preparation of High School Teachers of Economics." Journal of Economic Education 2, no. 1 (Fall, 1970): 69-77.

IV. Dissertations

Fucilla, Vincent John. "The Committee for Economic Development." Ph.D. dissertation. New York University, 1969.

Prehn, Edward C. "Twenty Years of Economic Education in the New York City Schools: 1945-1965." Ph.D. dissertation. New York University, 1968.

V. Newspapers

George Fersh. "Linking Science and Economics." Letter to the New York Times. November 16, 1957, p. 18.

VI. Reports

American Economic Association. Reports of the Committee on Economic Education, 1956-1978.

_____. Reports of the Committee on the Undergraduate Teaching of Economics, 1945-1950.

_____. Reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on Economic Education, 1953-56.

BIOGRAPHY

Richard Nelson Hill was born in New York City on April 12, 1941, the son of Arnold and Alice Hill. At the age of seven he moved with his mother and three brothers to Sebring, Florida, where he attended the public schools. He graduated from Sebring High School in 1959, and was the class valedictorian. Turning down an appointment to the United States Military Academy he attended Davidson College in North Carolina. While at Davidson he was one of the first Charles A. Dana Scholars, and graduated in 1963. Commissioned an officer in the artillery branch of the United States Army, he was stationed in Bamberg, Germany, for three years.

He entered Duke University in 1967 as a graduate student in European history, changed to the field of education and was awarded the M.A.T. degree in 1970. In the summer of 1971 he was an R. J. Reynolds Fellow in Economics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He was employed as a social studies teacher at C. E. Jordan High School in Durham County, North Carolina, in 1969, and has been the department coordinator since 1971.

He was married to Katherine Scott Beaver in December, 1963, and they have two children, Kathy and Chris. They currently reside in Durham.